

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXXIV, 1.

WHOLE No. 133.

---

## I.—THE DIALOGUE OF TACITUS.

The preparation of a text and translation for the Loeb Classical Library has sent me back to the *Dialogus*. It is just twenty years since my edition was published in the Clarendon Press Series, and in the interval the literature of the subject has grown very considerably. One might almost think that our generation had deliberately set itself to make amends for the neglect of previous times. Special studies have been undertaken in the learned journals; new editions have been produced; and above all fresh light has been thrown by quite recent discoveries on some at least of the problems which have made the *Dialogus* one of the puzzles of literary antiquity. I wish to speak in this paper of what can now be called with confidence the Hersfeld archetype, and of a recent attempt to use the new evidence that has come to light in support of a textual theory which I believe to be unfounded, and which must in any case be left to rest, as formerly, on internal evidence alone.

In his monumental edition of the *Dialogus*, Gudeman followed Voigt in rejecting without hesitation (p. cxx, note 206) the tradition which ascribed the rediscovery of the minor works of Tacitus to Enoch of Ascoli. But this is a case where it would have been better not to be so positive. For not only is the tradition vindicated (and accepted now, by the way, by Gudeman himself), but a portion of the 10th century archetype recovered by Enoch at Hersfeld and brought by him to Italy has been found incorporated with a 15th century manuscript at Iesi. It seems hardly creditable to Italian scholarship that a codex so

important as that which turned up in a private library only ten years ago should have lain hid so long. If it had been reported earlier it would have saved much discussion. The incident is significant as showing that while scholars are busy looking in many lands for what is underground, some things are still to be found above the surface in Italy itself.

For the purposes of my edition published by the Oxford Press, I collated a somewhat neglected manuscript in the British Museum, the *Harleianus* 2639, containing the Suetonius fragment and the Dialogue. The fact that the Suetonius comes first in this codex did not blind me to the importance of a note which I reported (p. lxxix) as occurring at the end of the text—*Hic antiquissimum exemplar finit et hoc integrum videtur*. The obvious inference from these words was that the *Harleianus* derived, either directly or indirectly, from an ancient manuscript which must have been the archetype of the two lost codices that are known as X and Y. And as the *Harleianus* was written in Italy, it seemed reasonable to conclude that it was no mere copy of an ancient original that Enoch brought from Hersfeld, but the *antiquissimum exemplar* itself.

This view turns out now to be amply justified by the facts. The Suetonius fragment was the last of four treatises contained in the Hersfeld original, the other three being (1) The Germania, (2) The Agricola, and (3) The Dialogus. It was in 1901 that Sabbadini announced<sup>1</sup> the discovery in an Ambrosian MS. (R. 88 sup. f. 112) of certain references entered in his diary by Pier Candido Decembrio (1399-1477), about the time of Enoch's return from the mission on which he had been sent in search of manuscripts. The entry begins with the words "Cornelii taciti liber reperitur Rome visus 1455 de Origine et situ Germanie". It was in 1451 that Pope Nicholas V had sent Enoch into Northern Europe, and this note makes it certain that he was back at Rome in 1455, bringing his sheaves with him. Decembrio quotes the beginning and end of the Germania, which he describes as a codex in double columns, containing 12 folia,—"*opus est foliorum XII in columnellis*". The Agricola is next described in the same way, and is said to have been comprised in 14 folia. The account given of the Dialogus, which comes next, must be quoted almost as it stands: "Cornelii taciti dialogus de oratori-

<sup>1</sup> Rivista di fil. class. XXIX (1901) p. 262 sq.

bus. Incipit: *Sepe ex me requiris . . . . oratoris retineat*: Opus foliorum XIII in columnellis. Post hec deficiunt sex folia. nam finit: *quam ingentibus verbis prosequuntur*.<sup>1</sup> *Cum ad veros iudices ventum*. Deinde sequitur: *rem cogitare nihil abiectum nihil humile*. Post hec sequuntur folia duo cum dimidio, et finit: *Cum adrisissent discessimus*".

The fourth and last treatise is described as "Suetonii tranquilli de grammaticis et rhetoribus liber", in seven folia. In connection with an argument which will be developed later, it may be important to remark here that in citing the concluding portion of this treatise Decembrio must have read clearly in his archetype the words *proconsulem* and *conspectu*, which afterwards became corrupted, the former into *personalem* A B, and the latter into *ypseum* A, *ipsea* B. This suggests that the compendia which have been noted as characteristic of the text may have been due, not to the Hersfeld archetype, but to X, the lost original of A and B.

The discovery of Decembrio's note would have sufficed to vindicate the tradition of Enoch's connection with the Hersfeld codex. But the sequel is even more remarkable. Only a year or two after Sabbadini made his communication, the discovery was announced (as a matter of fact, at the International Congress of Historians held at Rome in 1903) in the library of Count Guglielmi-Balleani at Iesi, in the district of Ancona, of a 15th century codex in which is incorporated a portion (one whole quaternion) of the *Agricola*, which obviously formed part of the "antiquissimum exemplar" brought from Hersfeld to Rome in 1455.<sup>2</sup>

The new evidence is being invoked to settle two important textual problems, first the extent and nature of the great lacuna at the end of ch. 35, and secondly the suggestion, which has received much support, that a second lacuna must be assumed in the text after the words *faces admovebant* in 40, 7 (Teubner text). It seems to me that in regard to the former of these two problems no certain result has yet been reached, while as to the second the facts have been altogether wrongly interpreted.

<sup>1</sup> Incidentally this establishes the reading *prosequantur* (*prosequuntur* A B E V<sup>2</sup>: *persequuntur* H V: *persequimur* D: *persequuntur* C Δ).

<sup>2</sup> See Annibaldi, *L'Agricola e La Germania di Cornelio Tacito nel MS. Latino N. 8 della biblioteca del Conte G-Balleani in Iesi, Città di Castello, 1907*, and the same editor's *La Germania*, Leipzig, 1910; also Wissowa's preface to the Leiden facsimile (Sijthoff, Leiden, 1907).

Let me take the second first. The view set forth in the introduction to my edition of the Dialogue is the traditional and conservative one, viz: that chs. 36 to 41 form a continuous whole and must be credited to one speaker, Maternus. That there are repetitions in his discourse, and even redundancies, must be admitted; the speaker shows that he is conscious of them himself (e. g. *ut subinde admoneo* 37, 31), and they seem to have been motivated by what had been said, probably by Secundus as well as by Messalla, in that part of the debate which has been lost in the great lacuna. But the critics go too far in my opinion when they speak of contradictions<sup>1</sup> in addition to repetitions,—some of them even vainly endeavoring to make out that there are inconsistencies between what Maternus says here of the scope of republican oratory and the ideal which he describes in the speech he made at the opening of the discussion on the comparative merits of oratory and poetry.

Now as to the MS. evidence. In Classical Philology, Vol. 7, No. 4, pages 412-419 (October, 1912,) Dr. Alfred Gudeman sets forth what he believes to be an "amazing confirmation" of the theory that a second lacuna must be assumed in the text after ch. 40, 7. It is well known that such lacunae do not usually occur at the end of a sentence, as is the case here, and the theory in question would be greatly strengthened if it were possible to show that the words "*faces admovebant*", which close the sentence, occurred at the foot of the verso of a page in the archetype; the loss of the succeeding folio may easily then have given rise to a lacuna not noticed by the next copyist,—especially if he found the following page beginning with the new sentence, *Non de otiosa*, etc., which of course is pure supposition. In order to furnish the necessary proof Dr. Gudeman assumes that the words with which ch. 36 now begins, "*Rem cogitant*", were at the beginning of the page in the archetype which followed the great lacuna. This assumption (unlike the one in regard to *Non de otiosa*, etc.) he is probably entitled to make, as the most likely theory about the great lacuna is that it was caused by the actual loss or the total disfigurement of certain complete folia in the original.

<sup>1</sup> The best statement of the argument under this head will be found in the Preface to the edition by C. John (Weidmann, Berlin, 1899) p. 39 sqq. See on the other hand my edition, Introd. p. xxxviii sqq.; and cp. Hendrickson in Am. J. Ph. xvi (1895) pp. 84-86.



Arguing from these premises Dr. Gudeman takes the diplomatic edition of the text of the *Agricola* published by Annibaldi, and founds on it his alleged proof that the portion of the Dialogue from ch. 36 to "*faces admovebant*" at ch. 40, 7, would make exactly two folia or four pages of the archetype. Having presented the case so that we are bound to suppose that a leaf may have been accidentally lost "at the precise juncture where the strongest of internal reasons pointed to an interruption of the context" he calls it a "coincidence too marvelous for credence", and proceeds to establish the theory by the processes of arithmetic. I shall not be doing Dr. Gudeman any injustice if I briefly summarize his argument as follows: An average page of the *Agricola* MS. as printed in Annibaldi's diplomatic reproduction contained 282 cm. of text. Two folia, therefore, or four pages, would contain 1128 cm. of text. Now the entire length of the text of the Dialogue as printed in the Teubner edition from chs. 36 to 40, 7 is 1025.4 cm.,<sup>1</sup> but as 1 cm. of this edition is equal to 1.1 cm. of the archetype the same amount of text covered 1127.94 cm. in the MS. "Dividing this total by 282, the number of cm. to a page, we find that chs. 36 to 40, 6 [7] took up 3.999, or exactly 4 complete pages in the codex Hersfeldensis". If this calculation were correct Dr. Gudeman might certainly be excused for regarding the fractional difference as quite insignificant, amounting as it does to less than a single letter. He would have proved in fact that, as the verso of the second folio must have finished with the words *faces admovebant* at 40, 7, the lacuna postulated at that point in the text by Heumann, Andresen, John, and others must have been caused by the actual loss of a leaf or leaves in the archetype.

Unfortunately the calculation does not hold. In the first place let me call attention to the fact that it is based on averages, a somewhat slender foundation for a process claiming such arithmetical exactitude. The Teubner text is of course a known quantity: a full line measures 8.5 cm. But the case is different with the written text of the *Agricola* as it is preserved for us in the surviving quaternion of the archetype now found imbedded

<sup>1</sup> I am giving Dr. Gudeman the benefit of his own figures, but am bound at the same time to report that my measurements are different. Taking the Teubner text as it is printed in the 1901 edition I find 127 full lines (plus four spaces for capital letters) from ch. 36 to ch. 40, 7, and this gives at 8.5 cm. per line 1079.5 cm., not 1025.4.

in the codex Aesinus, which, by the way, does not yield the same measurements as Annibaldi's diplomatic reproduction. Dr. Gudeman gets his 282 cm. per page by calculating the length of a column line in Annibaldi's printed text as varying from 4.4 to 4.85 cm. or of a double line as varying between 8.8 and 9.7 cm., the grand average being 9.4 cm. As there are 30 lines to the page he multiplies 9.4 by 30 and gets 282.

Believing Gudeman's results to be as important as they are certainly remarkable, I set about to verify them, and resolved not to rely upon averages for the MS. lines as reproduced by Annibaldi, but to proceed by the method of actual measurement of his text. I find that the content of each of the 16 pages which make up the quaternion varies from 276.1 to 303.5 cm., and that the average is therefore not 282 cm., but 290.1, which would give nearly one Teubner line more for each page, and which for the four pages taken together increases the resulting difference from the single letter reported by Gudeman to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  Teubner lines, at the very least.

This, however, while establishing a doubt, would not in itself be sufficient to dispose of Dr. Gudeman's argument. The variations of script from one page to another of a manuscript are known to be considerable, and *on the supposition* that the copyist of the Dialogue was the same as the copyist of the Agricola, or at least that he was writing in the same style, it may be admitted that the text of chs. 36 to 40, 7 would go *approximately* into four pages of the MS.<sup>1</sup>

But the next consideration which I have to bring forward is altogether fatal to Dr. Gudeman's theory. The note in Decembrio's diary states that in the archetype the great lacuna was followed by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  folia, or five pages: "post hec sequuntur folia duo cum dimidio. et finit: *Cum adrisissent discessimus*". Four of these five pages Gudeman has accounted for by supposing that they contained the text of the Dialogue from chs. 36 to 40, 7. We have thus one page left. But the remaining text of

<sup>1</sup>My calculation is that the Agricola quaternion is contained in 491 full lines of the Teubner text. Two folia (or a quarter of a quaternion) would therefore go into  $122\frac{3}{4}$  lines. As a matter of fact there are 127 full Teubner lines from ch. 36 to 40, 7, which would go into two folia if we allow  $31\frac{3}{4}$  Teubner lines to each page here, instead of  $30\frac{2}{3}$  lines, which is the average for the Agricola quaternion. It may be noted that there are more chapters in the Agricola text, while the Dialogue is more continuous.

the Dialogue cannot by any stretch, either of imagination or of arithmetic, go into one page calculated on the same basis as the other four. My estimate is that with a colophon three folia, or six full pages, of the Agricola type would be needed to take in the 182 Teubner lines of the Dialogue from ch. 36 to the end. This is inconsistent with Decembrio's note, "folia duo cum dimidio", which we must take to be correct. Gudeman's arithmetical processes must be applied to the fifth page equally with the other four, and the grounds on which he bases what he calls a "surprising result" in regard to these are found completely to collapse when we come to deal with the remainder of the text.

The possibility may occur to some that Decembrio may have given an inaccurate report when he wrote "folia duo cum dimidio", and that he may have failed to include in his reckoning what may have been the verso of a leaf immediately preceding, making six pages in all instead of five. This would involve the explanation that the great lacuna was caused not by the actual loss of folia, but by their disfigurement, and that the text again becomes legible on the verso of the *sixth* page (post hec deficiunt *sex folia*), beginning with the words "rem cogitant". Such a hypothesis, while it would find room for the remainder of the text, is excluded by a fresh proof which may be held to point in a different direction in any attempt to estimate for the lost archetype of the Dialogue the amount of Teubner text that may have gone to the MS. page. Decembrio's note says that the Germania was contained in 12 folia, reproduced in the *codex Aesinus* by only 10 folia.<sup>1</sup> We need not have any difficulty here in accepting Decembrio's statement as absolutely correct. A comparison of the Germania text with the surviving quaternion of the Agricola makes it easily possible to reconstruct the archetype on the basis of Decembrio's 12 folia. Decembrio's note tells us next that the Agricola was contained in 14 folia. There is more difficulty here, but the important fact to note is that while the body of the work surviving in the old quaternion (13.2—40.6) is fully accounted for, and while careful calculation shows that the first four folia, no

<sup>1</sup> The copyist of the Germania in the *codex Aesinus* got  $6\frac{1}{4}$  additional Teubner lines into what is now 69<sup>r</sup>; if he did the same, as seems to be the fact, in each of his ten folia, or twenty pages, he would gain about 125 lines—just the equivalent of the two folia by which he reduced the size of the archetype.

longer extant, must have been written on pretty much the same scale, the case is different with the last two folia. It may even be significant that the last pages of the old quaternion have a somewhat larger content than most of the others. The seventh folio (63) has 291 cm. on the recto, and on the verso 297.9. The eighth (63) has on the recto 300.6 cm. and on the verso 294.5. Then follows a very considerable jump. Fortunately for us what was originally page 64 of the *Agricola* is still preserved, the writing having first been erased for the purpose of receiving the text of the *Germania*, where it is now page 69. In regard to this page the fact becomes of first-class importance that its content was greater than that of the *Agricola* pages upon which Gudeman's whole argument is based by no fewer than  $6\frac{1}{2}$  additional Teubner lines. In centimetres the increase is from 294.5 in 63<sup>v</sup> to 352.3 in 64<sup>r</sup>. The erased portion of the *Agricola* contained 37 lines of Teubner text<sup>1</sup> and the portion of the *Germania* substituted for it, as may be seen from the facsimile given in Annibaldi's edition, has just about the same amount. Annibaldi in fact has already noted (see his *Germania*, page 24), "*that the script of the last pages of the Agricola was different from that of the preserved quaternion; it was finer and closer and each line, therefore, contained a larger number of letters*". In his opinion, we have here a clear case of a different hand.

For the Dialogue these observations come to have the highest possible significance. Taking 290.1 as the average number of cm. for each page of the old quaternion, we are able to square our calculations with Decembrio's note, both for the preceding part of the *Agricola* and for the whole of the *Germania*. In the old quaternion there are 491 full Teubner lines. This gives an average of  $30\frac{1}{2}$  lines for every page of the MS. But towards the end of the quaternion, as remarked above, and still more after it, conditions begin to change. The first folio after the quaternion (64<sup>r</sup>) we find to have contained no fewer than 37 lines of the Teubner text of the *Agricola*. Following Annibaldi, who makes his calculations on the basis of the erasures still traceable in the MS., I am able to report that the original 64<sup>v</sup> con-

<sup>1</sup> Annibaldi tells us that page 64<sup>r</sup> of the original *Agricola* text, now erased, contained the parts from *ad Agricolam* in 40, 6 to *qui iturus* in 42, 4,—fully 37 Teubner lines. Compare his *L'Agricola*, etc. (1907), p. 138, with the facsimile given in his more recent *Germania* (1910).

tained 32 lines and 65 35 lines of Teubner text, while the last page of all, 65<sup>v</sup>, has 32 lines even without the colophon.

The bearing of these calculations on the Dialogue is this. Decembrio's note states that up to the great lacuna the text of this treatise was contained in 14 folia, or 28 pages. These pages must have been similar in character, not—as Gudeman wrongly imagines—to those folia of the *Agricola* which had the least content, but to those which had the greatest. We have seen how Gudeman's calculation breaks down entirely in regard to the last 2½ folia of the Dialogue, and it is found to be equally inapplicable to the first 14. I estimate that not 14 folia, but at the very least 15½ (with some additional space for capital letters), would be required for the amount of Teubner text that comes before the great lacuna, calculated at anything like 290.1 cm. to the manuscript page and say 30½ lines of Teubner text. This may be shown by the following proof: The *Agricola* quaternion contains, as has been said, 491 full lines of Teubner text; this gives us 122½ lines for 2 folia, or 4 pages. Multiplying by 7 to get Decembrio's fourteen folia we get 859½ Teubner lines, or with a deduction for the space that would be occupied by the title of the Dialogue, say, 850 lines. But the Dialogue contains, up to the great lacuna, 939 full lines of Teubner text, and we are therefore left with a residuum of 89 lines,—pretty nearly the equivalent of 1½ folia, or three pages, making 15½ folia in all. For the first 14 folia of the Dialogue it becomes necessary therefore to postulate an archetype which contained the equivalent of 34 full Teubner lines to the page, instead of 30½, as in the case of the *Agricola* quaternion. Our conclusion must be that the Dialogue was written in the style of the last two folia of the *Agricola*, and not in that of the extant quaternion.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover the same argument holds also in regard to the Suetonius fragment, which must have been written in pretty much the same script as the Dialogue—certainly not in that of the

<sup>1</sup> A minor proof of this conclusion may be cited here. In quoting from the Dialogue to show where the lacuna begins, Decembrio's note contains the words *quam ingentibus verbis prosequuntur. Cum ad veros iudices ventum . . .* Here *quam* is for *numquam*—the *num* having formed part of the previous line. I therefore take *quam . . . prosequuntur* as having formed one line in the archetype. With the usual contraction, *ingentib.*, this line contains 30 letters, which is the normal number, as may be seen from Annibaldi's facsimile of 69<sup>r</sup>.



Agricola quaternion. Decembrio's note assigns to it seven folia, and indicates that it finished abruptly with only a few lines in the last column. Now, whereas the Agricola quaternion contains about 491 full Teubner lines, the Suetonius fragment has considerably over 500, and these would certainly have required at least a full quaternion (i. e. 16 pages and more, instead of less than 14) if they had been written in the same style.<sup>1</sup>

We may now take our main conclusion as sufficiently established. There were two hands, not one, in the Hersfeldensis, and Gudeman's laborious argument, depending as it does on identity or the closest similarity of script, falls to the ground.

The two folios that were added to the third quaternion to complete the Agricola are an important factor in the new statement of the case. They are almost enough in themselves to invalidate the assumption that one and the same scribe was entrusted with the making of the whole codex. In that case, he would infallibly have carried forward the text of the Agricola into the fourth quaternion, in which he had to copy the Dialogus. He would, in fact, have made his transcript continuous. If the Agricola had been the last of the four treatises comprised in the Hersfeldensis, instead of the second, the addition of two folia to complete the text, instead of a new quaternion, would have been quite intelligible. But Decembrio's note is decisive on this point. It describes the codex as he saw it in Rome in 1455. I do not attach much importance to the fact that (Wissowa, p. ii) the inventory supplied to Poggio by the Hersfeld monk, as quoted by Antonius Panormita in 1426, shows the treatise of Frontinus "*de aquae ductibus*" intervening between the Agricola and the Dialogus. The citation is faulty in other respects. The important point for us is that it confirms the order of the treatises as given in Decembrio's note—(1) Germania, (2) Agricola, (3) Dialogus, (4) Suetonius. Otherwise we might have been inclined to suspect, from the order in which they occur in many MSS., that

<sup>1</sup> Another method of stating the argument is to take the Leiden facsimile, and note that whereas the fourteen folios of the Dialogus in the Hersfeld original need over 48 pages in the Leidensis (and correspondingly the "*folia duo cum dimidio*" more than 8 pages, and the seven Suetonius folios 25, counting the index), no more than 32 pages are required to contain all the 12 folios of the Germania. If the Leidensis had contained the Agricola, it would have given its 14 folia in about 38 pages, as against 48 for the corresponding number of Dialogus folios.

the Suetonius originally came first.<sup>1</sup> In any case the *Dialogus* and Suetonius portion was evidently regarded as easily detachable from the rest. These treatises are reproduced in several 15th century MSS. independently of the *Germania* and the *Agricola*. They are not included in the *codex Aesinus*. The inference must be that they were irrecoverably separated from the rest of the *Hersfeldensis* soon after its reappearance at Rome. The next owner of the *codex* after Enoch's death in 1457 was Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, afterwards Pius II (Wissowa, p. ix), and he seems to have kept as firm a hold on his property as Enoch himself had done. If he had permitted copies to be made, the *Agricola* would have come to light sooner than it did. As a matter of fact it is not included in either A or B, or even in the *editio Spirensis*, 1470. If a further separation had taken place, and if the *Agricola* had been detached from the *Germania*, that would help to explain how the last four folia of the latter treatise and the first four of the *Agricola* came to be separate—as we can see from the Iesi reproduction must have been the case. They formed, in fact, the second quaternion of the *Hersfeldensis*, which would have to be cut in two to effect the separation.

But all this is speculation, and nothing short of the recovery of the lost portions of the *Hersfeldensis* could set the remaining questions at rest. We have seen that there must have been two scribes. Were they contemporary, or is it conceivable that the *Hersfeld* *codex* was composite, consisting of two portions, one written in the 10th and the other in the 13th century? An affirmative answer would make the transmission of the *Dialogus*, under the name of Tacitus, a greater mystery than ever. It would probably have to imply that a copyist in the 13th century added two folia to complete the text of a 10th century MS. of the *Agricola*, and then went on to transcribe the *Dialogus* and the Suetonius from some unknown original.

It must suffice to state the conundrum without any further attempt to answer it. Annibaldi describes the two additional *Agricola* folios, which are now palimpsest, as considerably worn away and thinned by the process of rubbing, but he does not suggest any doubt as to their being an integral and original part

<sup>1</sup> The note in the *Harleianus* would still be quite appropriate, as indicating that there was no more of the Suetonius in the "*antiquissimum exemplar*", and that the text was complete (*'hoc integrum videtur'*).

of the 10th century Hersfeldensis. The 15th century copyist of the Aesinus used them, in accordance with a common practice, as an outside cover to stiffen the paper quires of his Germania.

The only argument derivable from internal evidence that can be adduced in favor of the theory here broached is that editors have inferred, as a rule, from the condition of the text both of the *Dialogus* and of the *Suetonius*, that the archetype must have abounded in the compendia that were characteristic of the 13th century, whereas the 10th century script in which the *Agricola* quaternion is written is singularly free from any except the usual contractions. I have suggested, on the other hand (p. 3), that the compendia in question may have been due, not to the archetype, but to one of the very few copies which its owner permitted to be transcribed directly from it. To speak more particularly of the *Dialogus*. All the existing 15th century MSS. are understood to have been derived from the Hersfeldensis through two intermediaries, X and Y, which are no longer extant. If what I may call the 2d portion of the Hersfeld codex was 13th century, there would be room for mistakes. On the other hand the large number of variants, traceable to compendia, that are found in a codex like the Vaticanus D, may be explained by the assumption that these compendia originated in some intermediate copy: the only puzzle is how a current script of the 15th century can have presented any real difficulty.

I have left myself scarcely any room to speak of the second problem of the *Dialogue*, the length of the great lacuna. It is faithfully indicated in all the manuscripts, and the question is whether it occurred originally in the Hersfeld codex itself or in some predecessor. In the former case we should now be in a position to determine the real extent of the existing gap: in the latter, we should still be left to conjecture.

Here again the new factor in the problem is Decembrio's note. He tells us that there were 14 folia up to the words *Cum ad veros iudices ventum* in which the lacuna begins (ch. 35) and adds "Post hec deficient sex<sup>1</sup> folia . . . Deinde sequitur: 'rem

<sup>1</sup> Students of the text of the *Dialogus* will note Decembrio's agreement here with the Y tradition in *cogitare* and *nihil* (for *cogitant* and *vel* in X). The transposition of the vulgate *nihil humile nihil abiectum* may be explained either as a reminiscence of Cicero (see my note *ad loc.*) or as the result of an

*cogitare nihil abiectum, nihil humile*'. Post hec sequuntur folia duo cum dimidio et finit: *Cum adrisissent discessimus*".

This is a very definite statement by a careful observer, and it must mean that the lacuna began after the 14th folio, which must have been the 6th folio of the 5th quaternion in the Hersfeldensis. Moreover if we are to interpret Decembrio's note as meaning that the codex had  $16\frac{1}{2}$  folia and was minus 6, it is easy to calculate that the lacuna amounts to  $\frac{4}{15}$  of the whole treatise, or rather more than one-fourth.

On the other hand the Vatican codex 1862 (A), has the marginal note "*hic desunt sex pagelle*", and the Leidensis (B) "*deerant in exemplari sex pagellae vetustate consumptae*". I call attention to the difference (though there may be very little in it) between B's *deerant* and the present tense *deficiunt*, and *desunt* in the other two notes. The use of the present seems to point (certainly in the case of Decembrio) to first-hand observation, whereas B is generally believed<sup>1</sup> to be a copy, not of the Hersfeld archetype, but of the transcript from that original made by Pontanus, to whom we must also attribute the words "*vetustate consumptae*". It is difficult to account for the discrepancy between "*folia*" on the one hand and "*pagellae*" on the other: if it is an affair of single pages, the extent of the lacuna may obviously be reduced by one-half.<sup>2</sup> But was the missing portion indicated only by a note in the Hersfeld original, or were the

---

unintentional omission in the archetype in consequence of which one of the two *nihil* clauses was added above the line and was taken in by Decembrio at the wrong place.

<sup>1</sup> Massmann's view, however (see his edition of the *Germania*, 1847), that the Leiden MS. was written by Pontanus himself, has recently been revived. I am informed by Prof. B. L. Ullman of the University of Pittsburgh that he has made a special study of this problem, and that he believes that most of the corrections and marginal notes in the Leiden MS. as well as those in other MSS. known to have been written by the same copyist, are all in the same hand as the text, viz., that of Pontanus. The text is in his most formal style, while the notes vary considerably. It should be stated also, as against Wissowa, that *excripsit* in the note on f. 47<sup>v</sup> of the Leiden codex (Iov. Pontanus Umber excripsit) means 'copied', not 'composed'.

<sup>2</sup> The number six is vouched for not only by Decembrio's note (*sex folia*), but also by A B and E (*sex paginae*, or *pagellae*). On the other hand, when the copyist of Ven. says '*hic deficiunt quattuor parvae pagellae*', it is obvious that the reference is to the MS. from which he was making his transcript.

folia actually there, though in such a condition that they could not be read? Wissowa takes the former view, holding that the loss of the folia had already occurred in a predecessor of the Hersfeldensis. This enables him to reconstruct the second part of the archetype in three quaternions—16 folia for the Dialogue, with the last page on 1<sup>r</sup> of the third quaternion, and the remaining 7 folia of that quaternion for the Suetonius fragment. I find great difficulty in accepting this reconstruction. It would of course dispose, more effectively than ever—so far as the Hersfeld codex is concerned—of the hypothesis of a second lacuna after 40, 7, because if all the folia in that codex are accounted for in this way none can have been lost. But if it is correct, what are we to make of Pontanus's description of the archetype? In another note on the verso of the 47th page of the Leidensis, he makes a further contribution to our knowledge of its condition, speaking again of Enoch's search for *libri*, and referring obviously to the Hersfeld archetype: "hos quanquam mendosos et imperfectos ad nos retulit". If the codex Hersfeldensis was complete as regards its external form, and if the great lacuna which it had inherited from its predecessor was indicated only by a marginal note, why did Pontanus use such epithets as "mendosos" and "imperfectos"? And what is the meaning of 'vetustate consumptae' in the marginal note in B at the end of ch. 35?

It seems far more probable that the defective portion of the Dialogue was actually contained in the archetype as brought from Hersfeld to Rome, but in such a state of disfigurement and mutilation that the folia could not be deciphered by a transcriber. The description of the codex given by Pontanus would seem to be too strongly colored if its main defect consisted merely in the fact that the Suetonius fragment finished abruptly in an uncompleted column,—with another note by Pontanus in the margin of his copy,

"Amplius repertum non est adhuc".

W. PETERSON.



## II.—DERIVATIVES OF THE ROOT *STHA* IN COMPOSITION.

### II.<sup>1</sup>

SUPERLATIVES IN *-STHO-S* 'STANDING' (See AJPh. XXXI, 409 sq.).

43. I do not propose to rehearse my arguments here further than again to assert their semantic aptness. Skr. *yāj-i-ṣṭhas* (see also § 100) is not ill absolved by the definition 'in-sacris-stans'—of a steady sacrificer—and *nēdi-ṣṭhas* 'proximus' by analysis as *\*na-sd-i* 'sub sede' (cf. Av. *asne* 'prope', loc. to Indo-Iran. *ā-zd-na* 'in-sede', v. Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2, 816) + *\*stha-s* 'stans'. In Homeric *ἄγχι-στον* the adverbial prius 'prope' demands, almost, if we exercise our common sense (see § 3), that we take *-στον* as a verbal, and in the common turn *ὅθι τ' ἄγχι-στον πέλεν αὐτῷ* the translation 'ubi ei prope-stans erat' is perfectly adequate. Its propriety is its proof, and proof enough. What derivation could better suit the ordinal ending *-sthos* than from the verb 'to stand'? And the propriety of the same ending for the superlative (often also ordinal, see AJPh. 31, 404) is, as such things go, proof. The same may be said of the analysis of *πρό-τερος* as *vor-fahrend* (l. c. 408 sq.), and of *pri-or* as 'prae-iens' (ib. 423 sq.). Etymology, derivation, is the condition precedent to all phonetics, to all mor-

<sup>1</sup>See A. J. P. XXXIII 377-400. To § 42 add § 42a; cf. §§ 6-8. I now explain the frequent deaspiration of *-sthi-* as due to the case forms where *-sthy-* came into being. In Greek, we know, every *y-* became a rough breathing. This means that *y-* was itself aspirated = *hy-* (cf. also the Avestan doublet *yaṭ—hyaṭ*, where *h-* does not, in Bartholomae's opinion, represent *s*, see his Woert., col. 1227). In the group *-sthy-* the aspiration of *t* was given up for the aspiration inherent in the *y*. This perfectly accounts for the preservation of *th* in *apāṣṭhi-hān-*, with invariable *i*, and its reduction to *t* in *dyo' pāṣṭi-s* (see § 62), where *i* varied in the flexion with *y*. It also accounts for the difference in point of aspiration between an apparently abstract stem like *pāniṣṭi-* 'laus' (?) and the superlative (§ 43) *pāni-ṣṭha-s* 'in laude (?) stans'. See also § 100.—E. W. F.

phology, and our morphological explanations of the comparative and superlative have to be made to fit obvious etymologies. So it is with the phonetic laws. They are well used as "receipts for etymologizing", standards of measurement, that is, but they depend on, are secondary to, the etymologies, to which they must be made to conform, and not conversely.

MATERIAL OBJECTS THAT PROJECT: PRONGS, HOOKS, BARBS, STICKS, ETC.

44. Pāṇini referred *apaṣṭha-* 'barb-point' (cf. Vedic *apāṣṭhā-s* 'hook') to the root *sthā* (see Wackernagel, ai. Gram. I. § 205 b. anm.) To justify Pāṇini all we need to do is to bring forward Lith. *āksti-s* 'spit, prong', *ākstinas* = OBulg. *ostinū* 'goad', of which the primary sense was 'sharp-standing'.<sup>1</sup> In the Vedic form actually of record we have *apa* 'ab' + *aksthō-s* 'sharp standing' (with *k* [not *ḥ*] as in Lithuanian; see further Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *acus*). In the *sth* of *apa-ṣṭha-* 'exstans' we have a tribute to the Vedic word of record, unless we follow Wackernagel (in which case we must write *ap'-aṣṭha-*) and derive the posterius from *\*āk-tha-*: *āṣ-trā-* 'goad' (l. c. § 202 b.).<sup>2</sup> There is no sound reason, however, to exclude *apa-ṣṭha-s* and *pra-ṣṭha-s* from the group of words that show hyper-lingualism of the root *sthā-* (see Wackernagel, § 205 c. anm.; § 206 b), and Pāṇini is doubtless right as against Wackernagel (§ 206 b. anm.) in the analysis of *āmba-ṣṭha-*, name of a people. The analysis as *amb(h)as-* (*b* as in *ambu-* or by deaspiration?) 'water' + *stha-s* 'habitans' may be

<sup>1</sup>Here cf. the Celtic base *akto-* 'goad' (? from *aksto-* § 12), and Welsh *eithiw* for which Stokes-Fick<sup>4</sup> (p. 5) write a start-form *aktīvo-* (i. e. *ak-<s>tīvo-*), posterius: Lat. *stiva* (see § 4). The thorny *genesta* bore in OIr. the name *aillenn*, start-form *ak-<s>tīnā* 'sharp-standing' (see on *-stīnā* § 16).

<sup>2</sup>To refuse to analyze *dṣ-trā* as 'sharp-tool' or 'sharp-borer' is again to shrink from the obvious. Why does the suffix *-tro-* designate tools? Because *-tro-* meant 'tool', and *τέρετρον* 'gimlet' is hardly more than a heavily reduplicated word. I entirely agree with Prellwitz<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *τεῖρω*, that the agent suffix *-tōr-* | *-tēr-* is also a noun derived from the root *ter-*, and the mystery of *ū* in Latin words like *nā-tūra*, *cul-tūra* disappears when we note that the root *ter-* 'bore' also had a form *twer-* 'facere', generalized in the large group of Slavic words gathered by Miklosich, Wtbch., p. 366, s. v. *tvorū*. For the way in which the future sense developed in the Latin forms in *-tūrus* see Zimmermann in KZ. 42, 305, and cf. Skr. *dātāsmi* literally = *dator sum*, but in usage = *dātūrus sum*.

compared with Varro's apparently sound explanations of *Interamna* and *Antemnae* (see l. l. 5, 28).

45. With Skr. *apa-ṣṭha*- Lat. *dē-stina* 'prop' may be compared, cf. Lat. *destinare* 'to make fast', usually of record in the sense of 'to lash', but in the last analysis 'to lash' and 'to peg' continually interchange (see TAPA. 41, 34 sq.). One may remind himself of the use of forked branches of trees to fasten logs securely to the ground, for instance. In its vocalism *-stina* is comparable with Lith. *āk-stina-s*. It is curious also that *re-stis* 'stay' (a large rope) admits of so pat a rendering as 'back-stay'. A happy chance preserves in Av. *srvi-stāy-* 'mit hörnern widerhaken' (of an arrow) not only a proof of the root *sthāy-* (§ 5), but a proof of the meaning 'exstans' applied to a 'prong' or 'barb'.<sup>1</sup>

46. With the posterius of Lith. *āk-sti-nas*, Lat. *sti-lus* and *stimulus* also invite identification, and *ungustus* 'fustis uncus'

<sup>1</sup> Bartholomae's analysis of *srvi-stāy-* results in the definition 'dem ein horn-(spitzen)-paar als ständer dient' and according to him *srvi* is a dual, a not altogether self-evident type of compound. Perhaps *srvi* is a locative (with *i*, a quantity Bartholomae demands, Gr. Ir. Ph. § 219, 2 b.) and meant 'in cornu', taking *cornu* as 'bow'. This analysis suggests the derivation of Latin *sagitta* arrow from *\*sagi-sta-*, with dissimilation of the second *s* to *t* (cf. the *ç-sth* dissimilation in the Skr. proper name *açva-tthāman-* = equi-stator, but it is not clear that the banyan tree, *açva-tthā-s*, was the 'horse-stall', see Fay, AJPh. 17, 51). But what is *sagi-*? Possibly = Skr. *\*sa-jya-s*, whence *sajja-s* 'bow' (lit. with bowstring). Then *-gi-* is from *-gwi-* (*gwy*; cf. further examples in Osthoff, IF. 27, 174 sq.), and *sa-* some form cognate with "copulative" *ô-*, i. e. *sagitta* from *\*sogitta* by a change analogous to Wharton's so-called 'law', but dependent on the Latin, not IE. accentuation. Popular etymology may have played a part also, say from *sagmen* 'grass-stalk' or from *sagāx* 'acutus' (sc. mente); cf. also the gloss *sagatio* παλμός = 'vibratio'. In view of Skr. *ni-ṣāṅga-s* 'quiver' (lit. down-hanger), *ni-sāṅgīn-* 'sagittarius' the prius *sagi-* may have meant 'quiver'.—A third word for arrow with posterius in *-st-* is *διστός*. Barring the "prosthetic" *ô-*, this might be from *\*isu-st(h)o-s* (prius = Skr. *iṣu-* 'arrow' + tautological *-stho-s*: Lat. *stolo*, e. g. § 49), with haplogenic loss of *-us-*. Schrader's suggestion (Reallex. s. v. Pfeil) of a poisoned arrow permits of deriving from *\*o-wi(s)-stho-s* = 'cum viro'; cf. Skr. *viṣ-* 'faeces', expanded to *vi(ṣ)-ṣṭhā*: *viṣd-m* 'poison'. For the force of the *o-*, cf. *ô-βριμς* 'violentus' (from 'cum violentia'): *βριμῆ* 'violentia' (v. Johansson, IF. 3, 239). Brugmann's root-complex *ô-ist-* (see IF. 29, 229 sq.) is justified neither by *ôiw* (see § 23) nor *διστός*.—Along with Av. *srvi-stāy-* 'in cornu stans' and Lat. *sagitta* (from *\*sagista*) 'in cornū (in pharetra?) stans' note Goth. *arhw-asna* with prius = (in) arcu- and posterius from *\*o-s(d)-no-s* 'sedens' (cf. Brugmann, Gr. 2, 2, 816, on *δζος* 'twig': Av. *asne* 'prope') or 'twig' (see § 53).

(Festus) contains *ungo-* (or *ungos-*): *ungulus* 'ring' (cognate with *angulus*) + *-sthos* 'stake' (cf. § 49).

#### VEGETAL GROWTHS.

47. Among the commonest projecting objects are vegetal growths and objects made from them. Testimony to the use of the root *sthā* to describe such growths is found in Skr. *sthāvarā-s* with the strong connotation of "vegetabilisch" (PW), cf. Lith. *steverys* 'stem, stalk', *stavaris* 'knot, knob', *statinis* 'paling'.<sup>1</sup> and further note *στάσις* cited from Aristophanes, Fr. 683, 859, in the sense of τὰ πεφυκότα σπέρματα = Eng. *stand* (of corn, cotton, etc.). Perhaps *σῖτος* originally meant 'standing' (grain), and comes from \*σ[τ]ι-τος, cf. the hendiadys *segetem*<sup>2</sup> immutasse *statumque* in Lucilius 292. We have already noted above Lat. *stiv-a* 'spoke' (§ 4), *στόμ-τεξ* 'stud'<sup>3</sup> (§ 15), and *postis* (§ 16).

48. *βλάστη, βλαστός* 'a young sprout, scion'. The prius was *ml̥-* 'tener', belonging with the sept of Lat. *mollis*. In the verb *βλαστάνω* the posterius may represent an original verb in a compound of the *fest-steht* type.

49. Homeric *μάστι-* 'whip',<sup>4</sup> expanded into *μαστιγ-*, contains a posterius meaning 'stalk' or perhaps 'stick': *στίζω*, Lat. *in-stig-at*.<sup>5</sup> True, the *στίζω*-sept shows no aspiration (see § 7) in Skr. *tējate* 'is sharp', and to clarify the vowel relations we have to write *st(h)ā(y)-g-*, cf. Skr. *sthag-a-ra-m* | *tagara-m* of a pungent perfume. In *sthāgati* 'tegit': *στέγος* 'roof' we have another shade of meaning, arising from the 'studs' that supported the roof. All the notions here involved cluster in a <'pointed> stick'; see further on Lat. *fastigium* Fay, IF. 26, 37<sup>4</sup>. The out-of-Greek cognates of *μάστι-* comprise the sept of OHG. *mast* = 'stange, flag-staff, spear-shaft'. The prius of composition

<sup>1</sup> These words are extracted from the lexicon of Lalis, as Kurschat is not accessible to me. To them may be added the following which show root determinants, viz.: *stabas* 'post, stake', *stagaras* 'dry stalk, brush wood', *stakta* 'postis', *stambras* 'stalk', *stipinas* 'spoke', *stypline* 'stilt', *stūbris* 'stump', all of which are standing or projecting wooden objects.

<sup>2</sup> Proethnically dissimilated from *stheget*?

<sup>3</sup> The *-ic-* suffix is to be compared with *-i(e)c-* in Lat. *ob- <j> ēce <m>* (Plautus, Pers. 203) 'barrier', *sub-ic-es* 'supports', see on *ἰκρία* and Skr. *yaṣṭi-s* § 56. For the vowel color cf. *στοά* 'colonnade' (§ 15), and *στόμα* 'mouth' (§ 66).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Encyc. Brit. 17, 664: "The young shoots <of maple> . . . are employed in France as whips".

<sup>5</sup> Does *castigo* represent *ca[sto]-stigo* 'castum stigando facio'?

was *mad-* or *mat-* 'caedere' (v. Walde<sup>2</sup> s. vv. *malleus*, *mateola*). Lat. *mālus* 'mast' ('a beam in the wine press') is related—from *mad-* + *-st(ə)lo-s*: *στάλ-ιξ*, *σταλ-ίς* 'stake' (for fishing nets), cf. *στόλος* of 'oars, horns', etc., in Schulze's *Qu. Ep.*, 175 (excerpted by Prellwitz<sup>3</sup> s. v. *στελευς*): Lat. *stolo* 'sucker'. [With *μά-στι-ς* cf. *κνή-στι-ς* = 'scrape-stick'.]

50. In the plant names *ἄγρω[ς]-στις* (Homer) and *λιμνῆ(σ)-στις* the prius is a (local) genitive (cf. § 79 on *ἀγρώστης* 'agricola') describing the habitat of the plants. In *ἀκοστή*<sup>1</sup> 'barley' and *ἄκαστος* 'acus' (= 'maple tree') the prius belongs with *ak̂/k-* 'sharp'.

51. We have in Latin more general words like *arbu(s)-stum* 'tree-place' (*-stum* = *locus standi*, cf. Eng. *stand* in § 47), *arbu(s)-sta* (cf. Naevius ap. Non. 323, 7, *locos | ingenio arbusta ubi nata sunt, non obsitu*) = *arbores quae stant*,<sup>2</sup> and *robu(s)-stus* 'qui ut robur stat' (but cf. *scelestus*, § 82). The following have a more special character: (a) *arista*, thus described by Varro (r. r. 1, 48, 1): *ut acus tenuis longa eminet e gluma, proinde ut grani apex sit gluma et arista*. We may fairly define by 'apex' and analyze as *ari-sta* 'tip-standing', identical in its prius with *ἄρι-στος ἄρι-στεύς* (§ 81). (b) *genesta*. This plant, called 'humilis' by Virgil (G. 2, 434) may have been named from \**genes-* 'knee'<sup>3</sup> + *sta* 'stans' cf. *knee-holly* of the other broom plant, the

<sup>1</sup> The Homeric hapax *ἀκοστήσας* (Z 506 = O 263) has no cognation with *ἀκοστή*, first of record in Nicander (160 B. C.). The text runs:

ὥς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτῃ  
δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίῳ κροαίνων

and *ἀκο[ς]-στήσας* means *ἐν δεσμῷ ἐσταώς*, *ἀκος-* referring to the halter whereby the stalled horse was tied. I derive *ἀκος-* from \**h<sub>2</sub>kos-*: the root *e-nek̂/k* in Latin *necto*, etc. (see Fay, TAPA. 42, 31; 43). The root is also represented in *ἐντεσι-εργός* 'in harness working', *ἐντεα* 'harness, trappings', the stem *ἐντες-* being from *enkeues*, blended from *enkeu* (cf. Skr. *am̐cu-* 'stalk', i. e. 'vītex', see Fay, l. c. p. 52; and note *am̐cu-ka-m* 'vestis', from an original sense of 'trappings' = 'ornamenta') and *enkes-*: *nekes-* in Lat. *neces-se* 'in vinculis' (see l. c. p. 47); further note *ἐπάναγκες* which attests the *es-*stem (see on *ἀν-άγκη* = 'in vinculo', l. c. p. 46). For the parallelism of *u-* and *es-*stems cf. *penu-* | *peno-* | *penes-* (§ 79) and Skr. *ambu-* | *ambhas-* 'water' (§ 44), and on *genesta* (§ 51).

<sup>2</sup> Also note the use of *stare* in Titinius 144, *fundi stabunt* sentibus, Caecilius 219, *ager autem stet* sentibus?, Lucilius 1301, *stat* sentibus fundus.

<sup>3</sup> By the verbal homoeopathy characteristic of Roman medicine (see Fay, KZ. 45, 1281) a brew of *genesta* was prescribed for pains in the knees (*genua*), see Pliny, N. H. 24, 66, but that proves nothing save a popular etymology. In the *Pervigilium Veneris* (81) oxen take the shade (lying?) under the *genesta*.



*ruscus* or 'butcher's broom'. We have the *u/es* variation (see also § 50, fn.) in Skr. *cākṣu-/cakṣas-* 'eye', and an extended *-es-* stem in *γεειον* 'beard': *γέειν-s* 'chin'<sup>1</sup> and it seems a little thing to admit it also in Lat. *genes-*: *genu* 'knee', which belongs perhaps with *genu-inus* 'jaw-tooth' (v. Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. vv.).

52. In the Germanic group I note two plant names in *-st-*, viz: Eng. *gorst* 'genesta' and OHG. *gërsta* 'barley'. Both of these come from the root *gher-s-* | *gher-s-* 'to be rough; rub' (§ 76) + a posterius from the root *-sthā-* implying 'plant'. In Lat. *hordeum* 'barley' we have a prius *hor(s)-* (from *ghor-s-* or *ghr-s-*) + a posterius *\*dhēyom* 'plant': *fē-lix*, etc. (v. Walde, s. v.). The cognates nearest in meaning are Skr. *dhānyā-m* 'frumentum': [ἀκρο-] *θείνια* 'first fruits', cf. also Lat. *fē-tus* (as in Aen. 6, 141) of vegetal growths (see Fay, TAPA. 41, 25). In *κρτ-θή* 'barley' we have a cognate from the parallel root *ghrēy-* (as in *χρῆω*) 'to rub' + *-dh-ā-*, replacing *-dhē(y)*.<sup>2</sup> In view of *fordeum* = *hordeum* the equation of Lat. *frit* with *\*κρτ-θ* can hardly be refused, even if Walde<sup>2</sup> does not know how Plautus Most. 595 attests *frit* beyond a peradventure. The use of barleycorns for a least measure of weight (Greece) or of length (England) explains how *frit* = 'particle'. Varro's definition as quasi 'granulum' (r. r. 1, 48, 3) was probably merely *faute de mieux*.

53. Objects made from stoutly grown stalks are found in the following:

(a) Lat. *hasta* 'spear'. If the glossic word *harit* 'strikes' be disallowed (see Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *harena*), no verb form from a root *ghaxs* has yet been identified (on *hostit* see Fay, Class. Quart., I. 28.<sup>3</sup>), and if *hostus* is not rustic for *haustus* I would now derive it from *gho(s)-st(h)o-s* = 'ex-stans', cf. Eng. *output*, of the 'product of an industry'. Skr. *ghasra-s* 'nocens' developed from 'devorans'. The most salient fact about *hasta* is that it appears with *o* in Umbr. *ostatu* 'hastati'. Is this *o* original? Then why a in

<sup>1</sup> In *ἀρί-γων*, the quite late name of a kind of spear, *ἀρι-* might mean 'tip' and *-γων-* be cognate with *γέειν-s*, of the 'edge' of a fishing-hook or fork.

<sup>2</sup> See in general Fraenkel, KZ. 42, 241 sq. Of the Homeric forms, *κρτ-θ-άς* (if with *-άς*) matches the Skr. acc. plur. in *-ās* (post-Vedic, cf. Whitney<sup>2</sup>, § 351), but (*κρτ-θ-έων* (gen. plur.) matches Skr. *rāyām* (stem. *rāy-*). Note that Lat. (*hor-*)*deum* would be a legitimate gen. plur. The neut. sg. *κρτ-θ* has probably been abstracted from a neut. plur. *\*κρτ-θ-a*. The adjective *κρτ-θανιάς* (*πυρός*) = barley-like (wheat) has a posterius suspiciously like Skr. *dhānyā-m*.

<sup>3</sup> Accius, *Var.*, 12 has redhostire responsum.

*hasta*? Provisionally let us assume that *\*hosta* gave way in Latin to *hasta* by regressive vowel assimilation. A second confirmatory instance of anticipation of *a* I cannot bring.<sup>1</sup> Well, the precise conditions were not liable to arise often, and *costa* 'rib' may have resisted change because *co-* was for *co(n)-* (see § 67). The permanence of *o* in *toga* proves nothing against anticipation in *hasta* where the conditions are different. Accordingly, instead of setting up a root *ghas-/ghos-* 'ferire' for *hasta* and its few cognates (see Walde, s. v. and Stokes-Fick<sup>2</sup>, p. 108, s. v. *gastā* 'schoss, spross, reis'), we come out better by writing a start-form *\*gho(s)-stā* 'exstans', cf. Columella, 5, 11, 5, ut <surculi> de arbore exstent. Beside this start-form we must set *\*gho(s)-zdo-s* 'twig' whence OIr. *gat* 'Weidenruthen', *tris-gataim* (denom.) 'I bore through': Goth. *gazds*,<sup>2</sup> OHG. *gart/cart* 'goad'—whence by borrowing Pict. *cartit* 'Busennadel'. A form parallel with *gho(s)-zdo-* is found in Greek *ἄζος* from *\*o-sdo-s* 'on-sitting' (cf. Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. II. 2, 816): Goth. *asts*

<sup>1</sup> Far be it from me to try for precision as to the state of the consciousness, the degree of awareness, that constituted one of the conditions of vowel anticipation, but the phenomenon in speech does not totally differ from the phenomenon in copying out words, where the copyist proceeds by a sort of self-dictation, a thing that palaeographers often fail to recognize. Friedrich (ad Catull. 10, 21, p. 125) has collected a great number of palaeographic instances, and when he speaks of the phenomenon, which he describes in the words "vorgewalt des *a*" as "rein mechanisch", he has certainly not thought things out to a finish. These script examples—granting Friedrich's claims for them (but see Fay, AJPh. 31, 82)—have to be regarded as sporadic manifestations of anticipation due to self-dictation. That in the word *hasta* some special, if undiscoverable, circumstance favored the permanent registration of a sporadic anticipative *a* may be granted, entirely within the lines of the marked trend to general uniformity in the pronunciation of words—which is all that can be said for the (entirely social) uniformity of the phonetic laws. [On *locatio* for *locatio* see Stolz<sup>4</sup>, p. 74].

<sup>2</sup> I do not mean, of course, that in *gazds* *-zd-* continues IE. *-sd-* | *-zd-* but, as the content of this paragraph teaches, I recognize in these words describing the shoots of trees three forms of preposition prius, followed by *-sdo-* 'sedens' or *-stho-* 'stans', viz: *ghos-* and *ogh(s)-* 'ex-' and *o-* quasi 'ἐπί'. Beside *\*gho(s)-tho-s* a start-form *\*ogh(s)-stho-s* would have yielded *\*o(g)adho-s*, which, affecting *\*gho(s)-thos*, would have yielded *\*ghozdhos*, whence Goth. *gazds*. Or does *gazds* come, by Verner's law, from *\*ghos-thó-s* (note the syllabification), as it is assumed below that Goth. *husds* comes from *\*kus-thó-s* (§ 63)? For the oxytone accentuation cf. Skr. *nīdā-s* 'nest', but *\*nī-sdo-s* would be justified by *ἄζος* (from *\*o-sdo-s*). So we have *añgu-ṣṭhā-s* (Vedic) and *añgu-ṣṭha-s* (classic).

from *\*o-stho-s* 'on-standing', parallel with Ir. *gas*. With *\*gho(s)-st(h)ā* and *\*ghos-sdos* 'twig' we may combine *σσχη* 'twig' from *\*o-ghs- + k̂ā* 'out-lying', cf. *ἐσχατος* 'out-lying' (Fay, TAPA. 41, 50), recognizing *\*oghs*<sup>1</sup> beside *\*ēghs* (see § 12, fn.) as we have *\*epi/\*opi* and *\*ebhi/\*obhi* (cf. Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. 2. 2, 838; 820).

54. (b) Lat. *fustis* 'cudgel' from *bhū-* (cf. *bhū-d-* in Eng. *beat*, § 26) + *sthi-s*.

55. (c) OHG. *geisala* 'whip'. The start-form was possibly *gais-* (: *χαῖος* 'staff', Skr. *hi-nōti* 'drives')<sup>2</sup> + *s(t)hlo* as in *mālus* 'mast' above (§ 49). OHG. *gisal* 'hostage' belongs with Gallic *-geistlos* (v. Fick-Stokes<sup>4</sup>, 109). Can *-stlo-* here mean 'schössling' and *gei(s)-* (: the sept of Lat. *heres*, v. Walde s. v.) mean quasi 'relictus'? But *relictus stans* (§ 17<sup>2</sup>) might also be ventured.

56. (d) Skr. *yaśti-s*. In TAPA. 42, 27 I derived Av. *yax-šti-s* 'twig' from the root of *iacio*, which appears extended by *s* in Skr. *prayakṣati* 'se proicit (=rushes); consequatur' (cf. *iacula-tur* = 'hits, obtains'). The Indo-Iranian start-form was *yāk-st(h)i-s* (k, not k̂): Homeric *ἱκρία* (§ 47 fn.) which describes the planking of a ship's deck in general, but *ἱκρίον* means 'bohle, pfosten, balken' and *ἱκρία* = gebälk (see Capelle-Seiler, s. v.). As in Eng. *scaffold*, the name describing the supporting studs and braces also includes the platform they supported.

57. (e) Skr. *kā-ṣṭhā-m*. What was a *kāṣṭhām*? The ritual of the ÇBr. 1, 8, 3, 18 directs a process of smoothing with the fingers, and not with the *kāṣṭhām*; 3, 2, 1, 31 forbids a consecrated person to scratch himself with his nail or with a *kāṣṭhām*; 3, 3, 2, 8 forbids throwing away an accidental straw or *kāṣṭhām* found among soma-plants. Further, *kāṣṭhām* is the posterius in composition with *samidh-* 'faggot' and *tr̥ṇa-* 'grass'. The compound *kāṣṭha-rajju-* shows that the *kā-ṣṭhā-ni* were bound into bundles.

<sup>1</sup> From *oghs-* ὀφύ-ς 'hip' lets itself be explained as *\*oghs- + pū-*, the posterius cognate with πῦ-γῆ and Skr. *pu-tāu* (lexical only; cf. ὀισ-πώτη of a sheep's clotted buttocks; a root *pōw-*); cf. *prae-pūtium*? In *-pū-* we would have an original sense of quasi 'ruptus'. Cf. ON. *rump* 'steiss', and Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *rubus*.—Apropos of *steiss* Kluge writes the start-form *\*stiw-ot-* and compares Lat. *stiva* (§ 4). Of parts of the body ending in *ot* | *et* we also have Av. *brvat-*: Celtic *\*bruvat-* 'eye-brow' (Stokes-Fick<sup>2</sup>, 187). Skr. *bhasdd* 'hind-parts' may have started as a *t-* stem, but the sandhi forms with *d-* (e. g. before the *-bh-* cases) and in composition would have been generalized by association with *sad-* 'to sit'.

<sup>2</sup> Here *κί-σθος* (κίστος), a 'many-branched' (πολύκλαδος, cf. § 49) shrub.

The word was used as a measure of length, and also as a 'hohl-mass'. At the beginning of a compound it was an expression of praise. The inference is irresistible that *kā-ṣṭha-m* meant 'culmus' and secondarily 'culmen', and that it is to be derived from *kō(l)-* 'stalk' + *stho-m* (§ 46).

58. (f) Here we may note Lat. *fistula* 'hollow reed, reed-flute; ulcer'. This I derive from \**f*[*l*]*i-stula*, with posterius = 'stalk': Lat. *stolo* 'shoot, sucker' (cf. §§ 46, 49). The meaning 'ulcer' shows that the prius belongs in a general way with Lat. *flē-mina* 'swellings' (v. Walde<sup>2</sup> s. v.), cf. φλι-μέλια 'swellings': Norw. *blei-me*. The primitive, \**bhli-stolā* meant 'blow-stalk', but may also have signified 'swell-standing'. In Eng. *bli-ster* (O Dutch *blyster*) the prius would be at least related and *-ster* the result of dissimilation from *-st(h)lo-*, cf. for the sense of *-sthlo-* ἀπό-σσημα 'ulcer'. For the 'exstantia' of sores (eruptions) compare Lucilius 1195, inguen ne *exsistat*, papulae, tama, etc.

#### PARTS OF BODY.

59. Derivatives of *sthā* 'stare' are particularly common in names of parts of the body. Some of these are collected by Brugmann, IF. 18, 129 sq., as examples of an *-st-* formans (cf. Gr.<sup>2</sup> II. 1, § 479), without proper evaluation of the *sth* of Skr. *aṅgū-ṭha-s* 'thumb'; Av. *aṅgušta-* 'finger'. I have also studied some of these words in PAOS. 31, p. 412 sq., including the names of two fingers *tri-stho-s*<sup>1</sup> and *kṣw-eks-stho-s* (see §§ 31, 36) and παλα(ι)-στή 'palm', which I now define as *palam-stans*. Nor is it unlikely that Lat. *palam* came from \**palam-sthā* by discomposition, and that the prius belonged to *palma* 'palm of hand'. The root of *palma* may well have been that of Lat. *pel-lit* 'strikes'—used of the palm as a 'slapper'.

60. The posterius *-sthos* of parts of the body often had its full implication of 'exstans', doubtless, but just as often it may have been attached by congeneric adaptation, to return to Bloomfield's happy phrase in AJPh. 11, p. 2 sq.—as e. g. in Skr. *viṣ-|vi(ṣ)-ṣṭhā-* 'faeces' (§ 45, fn.).

61. Skr. *aṅgū-ṣṭha-s* 'thumb' = 'on hand standing' and *aṅgū-li-s* 'finger' = 'on hand lying' (see AJPh. 31, 416) would be perfectly convincing in their analysis were it not for

<sup>1</sup> On the relation of \**tri-sthi-s* 'third' to *testes* 'testiculi' see Fay, KZ. 43, 156. The *testes* were two members of one of nature's own triads.

*āṅga-m* 'membrum, corpus', which I unhesitatingly connect with MHG. *anke* 'gelenk am fuss', Eng. *ankle*, and with Aeol. *ἀμφην* 'neck'. The original sense was 'joint' and the root was *eneḡh-* | *eng-* 'to bind' (see TAPA. 42, 15). I derive *ἀμφην* 'neck' from *eneḡhw-*: Skr. *amhi* 'narrow' extended by an *-en-* suffix. For *ἀμφην* I set up a start-form *ṇḡhw-en-*, with possible anticipation of the *w*<sup>1</sup> as in Thess. *δαύχνα* = *δάφνη* (so, hesitatingly, Buck, Gr. Dial., § 68, 4a), and the same start-form accounts for *αὐχίν*, *φ* and *χ* being dialectic from *-ḡhw-* before *-on-* forms no longer in existence (cf. Lat. *caro* 'flesh', gen. *car(e)nis*). In Gothic *hals-agga* 'neck' (if not tautological 'neck-joint') the start-form lacked the *w* which we have in *aggwus* 'narrow'. The previous nasal had caused (IE.) deaspiration in Skr. *āṅga-m* 'joint': MHG. *anke* 'ankle'.

62. Before further collecting the materials it will be well to note Skr. *apāṣṭhi-hd(n)-* 'ungui-necans' and in RV. *áyo' pāṣṭi-s* 'aënam ungulam habens' (of the eagle), both belonging with *apāṣṭhā-s* (§ 44) and noteworthy because of the variation of *sth* with *st*. In view of this I shall not think any further notice necessary when we meet with deaspirated *st(h)* in names of parts of the body (cf. §§ 5, 6 [42 a]).

63. In the following group the prius is *ku-*, connected with Lat. *cavus* 'hollow', and the compound means 'hohl-stehend'. Skr. *kú-ṣṭhā* 'neb (i. e. spout) of a basket', *kú-ṣṭhā-s* 'Lendenhöhle' (?), cf. the compounds *kañ-ku-ṣṭhā-s* 'sort of earth', *kāla-ku-ṣṭhā-s* 'sort of earth found on mountains', wherein *-ku-ṣṭhā-s* suggests that the earth was gotten by a hole-digging process. In Greek we have, with easy shift of meaning, *κύστις* 'bladder', *κύστη* 'spongy bread', *κύσθος* 'pud. mul.', *κυσθοκοράνη*, glossed by *νύμφη*, which is glossed in turn by *τὸ μεταξὺ τοῦ γενείου καὶ τοῦ κάτω χεῖλους ἐν μέσῳ κοῖλον* (= chin-dimple), but also = *μύρτον* κλειτορίς. We also have in Skr. a *guṇa-* form *kó-ṣṭhā-s* 'unterleib, inner room, treasury'. In Latin *cu-stōd-* (*ō* as in *στόμις*, § 15; *d*: the *d* of Eng. *stand*, or = the *δ* of *στάδ-α*, see § 4) was 'qui apud cavum (thesauri) stat', and Gothic *huzd*

<sup>1</sup> Anticipation of *w* in pre-Greek *\*ekwo-s* rounded it to *ἵππος*, whence *ἵππος* (cf. also Meillet, Mem. Soc. Ling. 9, 136). Or the rough breathing of *ἵππος* may have to be accounted for by supposing confusion with *ἵππη* 'water', not omitting to note the sept of *ἱκμάς* (for *\*ikmas*: the Skr. root *sic* 'fluere'), see Fay, AJPh. 17. 3 sq., Walde, s. v., *equus*.



'treasure' may be derived, perhaps, by Verner's law from \**kus-t(h)ó-m*<sup>1</sup> (§ 53, fn.). [Add. *kúṣṭhi-kā* 'dew-claw'].

64. In the following group we probably have original euphemisms, viz: Skr. *ava(s)-sthā-s* (plur.) 'pud. mul.' = quasi 'dē-stantes'; *upā-stha-s* of the sexual organs = 'sub-stans' (whence, by discomposition, Skr. *upās-* womb?), cf. Skr. *upa + ā + sthā* = 'coire'. In *πόσθη* and *πόσθιον* 'membrum virile' the prius is (*a*)-*po-* or *po(s)-* = 'ab'<sup>2</sup>. With the posterius cf. colloquial *stake*<sup>3</sup>, quasi *στν-τός* (see § 20). [NHG. *leiste*, dial. Eng. *last* 'inguen' from Gothic *lai(s)-stō* contains a *stho-* posterius attached to a prius cognate with Lat. *lira* 'furca'. Lith. *ink-stas* 'festiculus, kidney' (prius: Lat. *ingu-en*) rather owes its posterius to irradiation (§ 60)].

65. For Skr. *pr-ṣthā-m* 'back', as for *pr-ṣṭī-s* 'rib', the definition is obviously 'prae-stans', while *pār-ṣu-s* 'rib' means 'prae-ciens' (= 'swelling', cf. *in-ciens* 'prae-gnas, grvida'). In Greek we have *ἄκρησις* 'back-bone', the prius being *ἀκρης-* (loc. gen., see § 50) = *ἀκμήs* (cf. on Osc. *akenēi*, Umbr. *per-akni*- Fay, Cl. Quart., 4, 83) 'atop'. Germ. *first* 'top of roof' = Skr. *pr-ṣthā-m*.

66. Skr. *o-ṣṭha-s* 'upper-lip' is matched by Av. *ao-šta-* 'upper-lip', but *ao-štra-* 'under-lip' corresponds minutely, save in gender, to Lat. *au-sc(u)lum* 'kiss' (lit. 'lip', see the examples), with posterius *st(h)olo-* 'stans' as above (cf. § 58). Cf. also *ō(s)-stium* 'mouth' of a river. The prius *au-* means 'ab', as in Lat. *au-fugit*, *au-fert*, cf. OPruss. *au-mūsnan* 'ab-waschung' (cited by Brugmann, Gr.<sup>2</sup> 2, 2, § 623). Query: Was it from the words for 'lip' that the diphthong *au* worked itself into the *ōs-* 'sept'?<sup>4</sup> The projecting mouth is described by *στόμα* (vowel-color as in *στόμιξ*, § 15, fn.).

<sup>1</sup> Greek *κεύ-θω* 'I hide' is itself a compound and meant 'I hole-put' (a compound in general like *type-write*, and recommended to golfers), and its participle \**ku-dhō-s*, whence \**ku-ddhō-* = 'in cavo positum', would serve well enough as a start-form for *huzd*, did it not separate it from *kō-ṣṭha-s* 'thesaurus' and from *custos*. Skr. *kō-ṣa-s* 'tub, treasure, treasury' will also be a compound = 'in cavo iacens'; posterius *-ṣa-*: *κεῖται* 'lies' (cf. Skr. *giri-ṣa-s*, VS., 'in monte habitans' with *ὄρεσ-κῶος*).

<sup>2</sup> Skr. *pas-* 'pud. mul.' would have come by discomposition, but PW<sup>2</sup>, no longer registers the word.

<sup>3</sup> For the figure cf. AP. 12, 232, *ὀρθὸν νῦν ἐστὴ καὶ ἀνώνυμον οὐδὲ μαράνῃ*.

<sup>4</sup> That *ōs-* is a gesture-word, *ō* or *au*, reproduced by lip-protrusion, and subsequently worked up into the flexional structure of the language, is altogether a probable guess.

67. Another group means 'thigh' or 'shin' or 'leg-bone' (cf. Eng. *bone*=Germ. *bein*), as in Av. *paiti-stāna*- "' (Gestell sva.) Bein', vom Fuss bis zur Hüfte" (see Bartholomae, lex., 837). We have in (later) Greek *ιστός* 'shin, leg-bone'. Lith. *staibiai* 'shinbones' can hardly, therefore, be anything but a derivative from *sthā(y)*- 'stare', reinforced by a *bh*- determinative, cf. *σφι-φ-ρός* 'solidus', Lith. *stabas* 'stob'. It is precisely matched, save possibly in vocalism, by Lat. (*s*)*tibia* 'shin-bone' which has lost its *s* by alliteration in the musical group we may indicate by *tibicen* 'piper': *tubicen* 'trumpeter'.<sup>1</sup> With this evidence before us we can hardly doubt that in Skr. *ā-sthi*- / *a-sthān*- 'bone' the posterius means 'stans'. For the generalization of 'bone' from (probably) 'leg-bone' cf. conversely Germ. *bein*; Eng. *bone* (= quasi 'fractum' in sense, from the root *bhēy* 'ferire', see § 18). In the prius I see *od*-, cognate with Skr. *ād-ri-s* 'stone, cliff'<sup>2</sup> (see PAOS. 31, 412<sup>1</sup>), Lith. *ad-ata* 'needle' (of bone?), *ðð-óús*; and with Skr. *ad-ga-s* 'rohr-stab, stengel'; also 'melted butter' (or some sort of sacrificial food, lexical).<sup>3</sup> The primary

<sup>1</sup> Walde<sup>2</sup> hazards no statement about the etymology of *tuba*. It is one of the numerous progeny of the root *tu*- 'to swell', and save for the difference in determinative belongs with "ON. *pollr* baum, hölzerner pflock, OEng. *pol* pflock" (Walde<sup>2</sup>, p. 798). The *tubus* or reed-pipe was 'hollow', i. e. air-swollen, cf. *tüber* of various swollen and knotty objects. For the specialization of meaning cf. Skr. *tū-līni* 'cotton-stalk': *tū-la-m* 'rispe' (= 'panicle' as used by Böhtlingk u. Roth, but the same word *rispe* = 'twig' as defined by Kluge). It seems a mere accident that Lat. *tüber* 'knob' (on wood) was never applied to the knot or joint of any of the reed growths.

<sup>2</sup> With *-ri*- as in Lat. *oc-ri-s* 'peak'; with *ād-ri-s* cf. Fr. *aiguille*, Eng. *needle* of 'points' of rock, or 'peaks'.

<sup>3</sup> The citations in the Petersburg lexicon do not enable me to find the connotations of *ād-ga-s*, but MPers. *azg* 'twig' admits of reference to *δσχος* (see § 53), and was perhaps a borrowing from Alexander's Greeks even. With *ād-ga-s* 'stirring-stick' (? a sort of 'chopstick') one naturally associates *khaḍgd-s* 'sword' wherein *-ga-* (for *gha-*) belongs with the root of *han*- 'ferire'. With *-ga-* cf. the posterius in *φάσ-γανον* 'sword'—whose prius *φάσ-* means 'maimer' or 'chewer'—and in *φρῦ(γ)γανον* 'dry-stick for burning'. [If we think of a 'spit' for cooking (cf. the verb *σραβείω*, one of the numerous derivatives of the root *sthā*-, 'I cook, roast', etc.) the apparent suffix in Skr. *bhṛj-jana-m* and in *τῆγανον* (both = 'roasting-pan') becomes clearer. Apropos of *φρῦγανον*, let me say in passing that its use for quasi 'shrubs' by Theophrastus in his classification of plants furnishes a complete parallel for my explanation in TAPA, 41, 25 of Skr. *ḍga-dhi-s* as (brenn-) pflanze]. In *φάσγανον* γ is for β by labial dissimilation in the sequence *bh-g(h)w*, with loss of aspiration before *n*, cf. *ἀμνός* 'lamb' (from *agwṇd-s*): OEng. *lanian* from *ogwhno-* (Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. I, § 704, anm.).

sense of *\*od-sthi-* would be quasi 'ess-bein', i. e. a marrow bone. The same *-sthi-* is found in Skr. *sak[s]thi-* 'thigh' ('keule') with prius *sak-*: *secat* 'cuts' (Fay, PAOS. 31, 412). In Latin *co-stae* 'ribs' we have the record of the observation of the 'con-stantia' of these bones, cf. OBulg. *ko-sti* 'bone', with a generalization somewhat more advanced than Germ. *gerippe* 'skeleton' (: Eng. *ribs* 'costae') exhibits.

68. To the root *sthā* I also refer the group of words represented by *στηνίον* *στηθος* 'breast', Skr. *stānāu* (dual) 'mammas', Av. *fstāna-* 'nodus, nipple', mod. Pers. *pi-stan* 'mamma', Arm. *stin*; cf. *stant papillae* (Lucilius),—*mammas* (Pliny). Starting with the form *\*pṣtāna-* (from IE. *p(ə)t-tā<sup>x</sup>na-*) for the Indo-Iranian group, Johansson (IF. 14, 324) has brought these words into connection with ON. *spine* 'teat' and Lith. *sp' nỹs*, integrating and disintegrating the letters of his equation—all in conformity with the laws of analogous changes—with a skill of which any analytical geometrician might be proud. Prellwitz<sup>1</sup> has adjusted all this, s. v. *στηθος*, to a start-form *\*pṣtē(i)n-dhos*. But none of these clever manipulations inspires confidence. How in the world did the Indo-Europeans come to such a designation as this?—for *pst-*, save in the onomatopoeia of sneezing and the like, is quite asyllabic. For the breasts of the human female the designation as (*ex*)*stantes* leaves nothing to desire. Originally the sense may have been something like 'knot, knob, protuberance', as in Lith. *stavaris*, e. g. In view of this notandum we may dismiss from consideration ON. *spine* and Lith. *spėnỹs* as belonging to the root *sphēy-* 'tumere', cf. Skr. *pīvaḥ-sphākā-* 'pinguū tumens', *sphīta-s* 'gequollen (of grains), regen-schwanger' (of a cloud swollen with rain), *sphā-ra-s* 'pustule', *sphi-gī* 'hip' (cf. on *ὀσφύς*, § 53);<sup>1</sup> cf. also *σπι-θαμή* 'span' (in accent like *παλα(ι)στή*,

<sup>1</sup> Or is *ὀσφύς* to be identified with *sphi-gī*? Then we must operate with a root *sphēy* | *sphōw* (see Fay, AJPh. 25, 371). Derivatives of this root seem to have meant not only 'largus' (in the Latin sense of 'copious, generous'), but also (like Spanish *largo*) 'longus' and 'latus' (cf. Lat. *spa-tium*). From substantivized 'longus' comes Skr. *sphyds* 'holz-span, opfermesser', cognate with the posterius in Lat. *sece-spi-ta* 'sacrificial knife': *spatula* and *σπάθη*. [Prellwitz has lately suggested (KZ. 44, 358) the identification of *spita* with *σπάθη*, but of course *spatula* is the nearer term]. Here the word actually designating the cutting instrument has been ousted by the adjective 'largus', cf. e. g. Span. *larga* 'mace' (in the game of billiards). It is as though in Eng. *long-bow* or *small-sword* the posterius had been omitted. Also cf. *sharps*, *betweens*, *blunts*, designations of three sorts of needles; *middles*, 'side-meat,

in suffix like *παλάμη*). We have the sense of 'largus', i. e. 'copiosus' in *sphi-rā-s* 'fat' (of the 'belly'), *pāyah-sphāti-* (AV. 19, 31, 10)<sup>1</sup> *pīvah-sphākā-s* 'von fett strotzend'.<sup>2</sup> Why refuse to see that a start-form \**sphēy-no-* 'swelling', with the legitimate weakenings of *ē(y)*, accounts phonetically and semantically for ON. *spine*, Lith. *spėnys*? This start-form also clears up Av. *fštāna-*, mod. Pers. *pī-stan*, as from (*s*)*ph(i)-stāna-* 'strotz-stehend'. The loss of the *i-* in the Avestan form will be due to the use of *p(i)-stāna-* in composition, cf. the compound *ərədva-fšna-* 'altimammus', wherein *fšna-* is a reduction of *fštāna-* (*ā* as in Skr. *stāna-*).

69. But *στηθος* and Skr. *stāna-* still have their difficulties, the former in its common Greek *η*,<sup>3</sup> and the latter in its deaspiration; yet *στηθος* shows how the deaspiration of *stāna* may have come about, and the *η* of *στηθος*, which meant rather 'chest' than 'mamma', may be due to association with *τήθη* and its sept, cf. *τιτθος* 'mamma'; : the root *dhē(y)-* 'to suckle'. Siebs (see KZ. 37, 294) might even derive *στη-* from *dhēy-*. For *στη-θος* there are various start-forms to reckon with, as e. g. *st(h)ā-stho-s* (reduplicated). Or *στη-* may be nominal (cf. *στέας* 'fat', Skr. *ghṛta-s* [h] *āu-a-s* [AV. 12, 2, 17] 'ghee-drops'—with non-contiguous deaspiration ?), governed by *-θος-* 'faciens, dans'.

70. Other words meaning 'breast' exhibit *-st(h)-* as a posterior. Thus we have in Greek *μαστός/μαστός* (Doric), but Homeric *μαζός*. For the first pair I think at first blush of 'mamma stans' as perhaps giving the correct clue to the derivation, but further facts need to be taken account of, viz: (1) Homeric *μαζός* from *μαστός*, whose *sd* varying with *-st(h)-* in *μαστός* suggests

bacon'; *middlings*, 'a sort of bran'; *tops*, 'plated buttons'. Such omissions characterize technic language. In Greek *μάσ-γανον* (§ 67) the prius may be from (*s*)*phās-* 'long': Skr. *sphy-d-s* 'long[-knife]'. With *sphyd-s* 'holz-span' OHG. *spahha*, with a different determinative, may be compared also Greek *σφάζει* (from *sphaz-g-*) 'sacrifices' (lit. 'uses a long[-knife]').

<sup>1</sup> Whitney properly renders in his translation by 'fatness of milk', after having joined Roth in their edition in emending to *gāya-sphāti-s*, doubtless because of *gāya-sphāna-* 'den hausstand mehrend' (RV.). Böhlingk in PW<sup>2</sup>. is curiously misleading when he enters "*gāyasphāti-* f. AV. 19, 31, 10, wohl fehlerhaft für *payah-sphāti-*".

<sup>2</sup> The root *sphē(y)-* can hardly be different in the last resort from the root found in Lat. *opimus* (v. Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v.).

<sup>3</sup> Herwerden, Lex<sup>2</sup>. s. v. quotes only literary instances which, if the word was taken up from Homer, after its disappearance from actual speech, can prove nothing.

that the prius must be a word to suit the postures indicated by 'sedens' and 'stans'; (2) the other parts of the body indicated by Skr. *māstaka-s* 'head, skull, point, peak', *μάσταξ* 'mouth', cf. *μύσταξ* 'upper lip, moustache' (see § 66), all names of 'projecting' parts of the body. The entire group is cognate with the words Lat. *mentum* 'chin' (cf. *mentula* 'membr. vir.') and Germ. *mund* 'mouth'; cf. also Lat. *mont-* 'peak'. Their prius was either *mṇt-* or *mṇ-* (cf. Lat. *e-min-et* 'projects'), though *μύσταξ* has at least the vowel of Skr. *mū-kha-m* 'mouth'.

71. The name of the 'breast' attested by Goth. *bru-sts* also had a posterius *-stho-s*. The root was, in a weak stage, *bhru-* (cf. Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *de-frūtum*), and meant 'swelling', cf. M Ir. *brú* 'belly', *bruinne* 'breast'. Here also belongs Skr. *bhrū-s* 'brow', Av. *brv-at-*, *δ-φρύς*. In Latin *frons* 'forehead' we have the continuant of *\*bhrōw-nt-*, whence pre-Latin *\*frōwent-*, *\*frōwont-*, *frōnt-*. For the suffix *-nt-*, replacing *-xt-* (see § 53), cf. *οὔαρ-α* 'aures', *ἦπ-αρ-ος* 'iecinoris'.

72. In Latin *crī-sta* 'tuft, top-knot' we have a locative prius *krī*<sup>1</sup> 'in capite', unless the *ī* is a reduction of the *-āy-* stem attested in *κραπῖλη* 'head-ache' (lit. 'splitting'), *κραῖ-πα* 'tip, point', (Fay KZ. 41, 208). With *crī-sta* cf. Av. *srvi-stāy-* above (§ 45).

73. In Latin *crinis* 'hair' the prius is *crī-* 'in capite' + *snī-s* 'positus, iacens' (: *sinit* 'lays', *ponit* 'lays off'?). The posterius is found also in Skr. *kapu[t]-ṣṇī-kā* 'haar-buschel', cf. *u-ṣṇī-ṣa-s* 'head-band' [by discate-nation from *[kap]u[t]-smī-ṣa-s*?] and may come from the root *snē(y)-* 'nēre, nexere, nectere'. For the sense and the locative prius note Skr. *ṣirasi-ja-* 'head-born', *ṣirasi-ruha-* 'head-grown', whence 'hair'.

74a. In Skr. *pr̥thu-ṣṭu-/pr̥thu-ṣṭu-ka-* (RV.) 'latam-cristam-habens' the posterius *st(h)u-* (with deaspiration) was named from its upright or 'standing' position. In English we similarly allocate 'top' to a hair growth in the word *fore-top*, used of the mane of a horse topping his forehead.

74b. Lat. *intestinum*: Skr. *antastyam* (Āit. Br.) and *antaḥ-sthā* (Ç. Br.) 'die im innern befindlich belebende kraft'. For the first pair of these, proethnic *entax[ṣ]-sthī-* is a very probable start-form, cf. Av. *antarə-šta-* of the space between sky and earth, which, like *antaḥ-sthā-*, shows recomposition with *antar-*. As in

<sup>1</sup> I see no good reason to question Bartholomae's a priori belief in a locative in *-ī*, but on this point I am expressing my convictions elsewhere. This case in *-ī* is alive in the Slavic languages (see Brugmann, Gr. <sup>2</sup>, II, 2, § 162, 1).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the gloss of Hesychius, *κραπῖλη* ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς χθιζῆς μέθης κεφαλῆς.



πρόσθιος etc. (§ 6) the Greek correspondent ἐνπρόσθια preserves the aspirate. The -*sthū* of Skr. *vani-ssthū*, one of the intestines, has already been put in the right light (v. Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *vensica*).

#### THE HAND AND FINGER GROUP.

75. At this point it seems expedient to explain some of the words in this group, and chiefly Skr. *aṅgú-stha-s* 'thumb' (= on hand standing, see § 61), *\*tri-stho-s* 'tip-standing' (of the mid-finger, § 31), *kszw-ek(s)-stho-s* 'co-ex-stans' (of the second thumb in the digital count, see § 36), and *παλα(ι)στή* 'palm' (§ 61). Brugmann's list in IF. 18, 129 sq. contained, besides Skr. *hásta-s* 'hand' and *gábhasti-s* (see also my discussion of these words in PAOS. 31, 412, where deaspirated -*st(h)o-s* and -*st(h)i-s* were interpreted as elements of composition), the following: (1) OBulg. *grū-stī* 'hand-full': Russ. *gorst'* 'hollow hand': (2) OHG. *fust*: OBulg. *pęstī* 'fist' (see on Av. *puxda-*, § 32); (3) Lith. *pīr-szta-s*: OBulg. *prū-stī* 'finger' [lit. = quasi 'prae-stans', cf. § 65]; (4) Alban. *gl'isht/g'isht* 'finger' [from *gwł-st(h)i-s* 'stachel-stehend': Lith. *gelūnīs* 'stachel', cf. Pedersen in KZ. 39, 393]. To these should be added the sept of Eng. *wrist*: Goth. *\*wristi* from *\*wrih-sti-* (see Kluge<sup>6</sup>, s. v. *rist*) and Skr. *muṣṭi-s* 'fist' from *\*muk-ssthī-s* with aspiration lost according to § 42 a. With *muṣṭi-s*: Av. *muṣti-* Lat. *mucro* 'point, blade' belongs, and the pair *pūgnus* 'fist': *pūgio* 'dagger' makes the comparison entirely probable (pace Charpentier in IF. 29, 398, who prefers a start-form *\*mut-sti-s*: Lat. *mūto* 'membr. vir.', a meaning also found for *muṣṭi-s*).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It seems strange that the etymology of Latin *mūto* has not been cleared up before now. It cannot be separated from the word *moetino* (abl.), Lucilius, ap. Non. 11, 1, cf. also Priap. 72, where *mutin(i)o* (abl.) = 'pēne'. Accordingly *u* is from *oe* as in Lat. *murus*: *moenia*. The low use of *stake* (see § 64) in our time fixes the relation of *moetinus*: Skr. *me-thī-s* 'stake'. So when the later Frontinus is cited for the spelling *moeta* = *mēta* we do well to conclude that he spelt correctly. From the use of *moetae*, which were probably phallic symbols (see Fay, AJPh. 26, 191, § 30 b), as goal-posts and termini, i. e. as measures of a race-track and of boundaries, confusion with *mētor* 'I measure' yielded the current form *mēta*. For the date when the hypocoristic spelling *mutto* was established we must wait for the materials of the Thesaurus, and then only inscriptional evidence would give certainty, not the MS. evidence of Porphyrio ad Horatium, S. 1, 2, 68. As a historical problem we know not when in the four to five hundred years that intervened between Lucilius (and Horace) on the one side and Porphyrio on the other the change from

## NAMES OF ANIMALS AND THEIR STALLS.

76. Note was taken above of the sense of 'stall' (§ 14), and ἀκοστήσας (§ 50) explained as from \*ἀκοστος 'in vinculo stans'. In English, *stud* which meant 'stall' has given rise to *stud-horse*, again shortened to *stud*. Still earlier, *steed* 'war-horse' was developed from the same root, cf. *stallion* from *stall* (cf. ἰππό-στα-σις and σταθμός), and see further Kluge, s. v. *stute* 'stud-mare'. These words, as well as Lith. *stódas*, implied a 'herd' of horses. What reason, then, to question the interpretation given above (§ 14) of *sunnistā* as 'herd of swine'? The *st* of OHG. *hengist* is also, then, a confix, cf. *hangisto* in the Lex Salica. The prius, *hangi-* or *hangi(s)-*, will then be cognate with Lat. *cingulum* 'girth', and the compound is comparable with \*ἀκοστος above. In either compound the prius may have designated a sort of halter, cf. ἡ ἐπὶ φατνίδια φορβεῖα (Xenophon) and ἡ αὐλητικὴ στομὴ (gloss of φορβεῖα, Hesychius). The differentiation of animals as 'stalled' (= τροφία) and 'grazing' (= φορβίδες) was ever so early an economic condition (see on *pecus* = 'tied' TAPA. 41, 34<sup>1</sup>). Thus Skr. *gr̥ṣṭi-s* 'heifer, heifer with her first calf' may be from \**g(h)rd(h)-sthis* 'in caulis stans', with prius: Av. *garada-* 'caverna'. The same form is also cited for 'boar' with a lexical variant \**ghr-ṣtis*. Could a stalled boar (think of the household pig in rural Ireland) be meant? Still, with Virgil's *sus horridus* before us we must feel like connecting the prius with the root \**gher(s)/gher(s)* 'to be rough; to scratch'<sup>1</sup> (v. Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. vv. *ēr* and *frendo*: it is quite unreasonable to refuse to unite two 'roots' of such meaning). With *gr̥ṣṭi-s* 'heifer', if from \**g(w)hr̥d(h)-sthis*, we may unite Lat. *forda* / *horda* 'pregnant heifer', if from \**g(w)hr̥d-zdhā*. I derive Goth. *fra-sts* 'progenies' from \**pro-sthi-s* whence also, *mut. mut.*, πορ[σ]τις 'heifer', cf. the counter terms πρό-βατον 'sheep' and Lat. *prōles*, *sub-oles* of children and young animals going before or under their drivers or begetters. By transfer to plants of some word like *suboles* the conditions arose under which the root written as *al-* 'nutrire' (in Lat. *alo*, cf. Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v.) grew up beside the root written as *el* 'ire' (ib. s. v. *ambulo*). With *suboles* of 'twigs' and of the

*mūto* to *mutto* may have taken place. As a phonetic question, folk Latin *mūccus* for *mūcus* and *glūtto* for *glūto* are parallel cases (see further Vendryes, *Intens.*, §§ 126 sq. and § 10). [In CIL. XIV, 1940, *muthunium*].

<sup>1</sup> Lucilius 333, *scaberat, ut porcus contritis arbore costis*, justifies this notandum for 'boar' from another side.

'hair', cf. Xenophon's use of ἀναβαίνειν to describe the growth of climbing plants and of the hair.

77. Besides the names of animal stalls already discussed in another connection (§ 14) attention must be called to Goth. *awistr* 'sheep-stall'. After all that has been said, Bezzenberger's comparison of *-str* (KZ. 22, 278) with Skr. *stara-s* 'stratum', Lat. *torus* 'couch', but above all with Lith. *strajė* 'straw; stall', especially 'horse-stall,' leaves nothing to desire. The sense of 'straw' is immediately discernible in OHG. *bol-star*<sup>1</sup>, ON. *bol-str* 'cushion' with prius: OSwed. *bul-in* auf-gebläht (v. Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>. 2, 1, p. 347); cf. the posterius with the sense of Lat. 'storia' in Goth. *huli(s?) -str*<sup>2</sup> 'cover', etc. In Goth. *ga-nawistrōn* 'sepelire' we have to recognize *\*nawī-str* 'cadaveris storia' (i. e. 'operculum'). For the propriety of this analysis of *awi-str* cf. further male *substernere* pecori (Pliny) and pullos *substernere*; and for *ga-nawistrōn* cf. στρώμα 'pavement' and 'viam sternere'.

#### SERVANTS AND MASTERS.

78. First of the words in this list I mention the pair already treated in another connection (§ 6), viz: *abhi-ṣṭi-s* 'hülle, förderung', but *abhi-ṣṭi-s* 'helfer, beistand' (both = Lat. 'opera'). The definition 'bei-stand' (cf. Fr. *assistant*) makes for conceiving the posterius as *-st[h]i-s*, and the appearance of *-st(h)ā-* in further words of this group should leave no doubt, as e. g. in *nī-ṣṭha-s*, used in the plural for 'dependents', i. e. 'servi'. Skr. *upa-sti-* (or *ūpa-sti-*) also means 'servant', and that this is for *\*upa-sthī-* scarcely admits of doubt when we note *upa-sthāyaka-s* (Buddhistic) 'servant' and Av. *upa-stā-* 'bei-stand, hilfe'. By discomposition (but see 43a) from *abhi-ṣṭi-s* and *upa-sti-s* we have *stī-n* 'clientes', even though it picked up all the significance attached to it by Ludwig on RV. x, 148, 4 (vol. v, p. 220) as "die bezeichnung der gesammten ansässigen und besitzberechtigten bevölkerung"—in contradistinction to the *upastī-*, or plebeian class. With *stī-pā-* 'protector of the *stī-*', used of Agni and Mitra-Varuna, cf. *abhiṣṭi-pā-* (RV. 2, 20, 2) used of Indra as protector

<sup>1</sup> Cf. in RV. *pra-stard-s* 'straw, seat on grass'. A Roman *lecti-sterneum* is directly suggested by the ritual passage (TS. 1, 3, 2) *prastare-ṣṭhā barhi-gadaṣca devā-h*, whence we may infer a *\*barhi(s)-ṣṭha <r>*- cognate with *bol-star*.

<sup>2</sup> Closest of kin is Lat. *colustra* 'biestings', but originally 'cream' = 'cover' of the milk', cf. Skr. *pī-yūṣa-m* (with both meanings) lit. = 'milk-soup' (*-yūṣa-m*: Lat. *jūs* 'soup'). In *colustra* we have a tautological compound = 'cover-cover' (see Fay in KZ. 45, 112, § 4).

of his 'assistants', i. e. servants and followers. Certainly it was with no etymological purpose in mind that Whitney (Gram<sup>2</sup>, 1250 b) defined *nare-sthā-s* (with *rātha-s* 'chariot' in RV.) by 'serving-a-man' ('man-serving'), but the definition makes for understanding *st(h)i-* as 'servant'. [Here see § 100].

79. In the light of *abhi-sti-s* 'opera' the analysis of *πενέ(ς)-σθης* as 'domi interioris stans', i. e. 'domesticus' is not open to any reasonable challenge. Like *πενέ[ς]-σθης*, but with an additional *ko-* suffix, is Lat. *domesticus*, wherein *domes-* may be modelled on Lat. *penes-* (/ *penu-* / *peno-*), or it may be genitive (with local force; cf. *ἀγρώ(σ)-σθης* 'ruri-stans', and see § 28) of monosyllabic *dom-*—unless the start-form was \**domo-sticus*. Homeric *ἀλφη-σθης* has a locative prius, *ἀλφ(α)(y)* 'at wage', cf. *ἐλεφαντι-σθης* 'elephant-driver' (Aristotle), which is, however, rather too late to be matched with Skr. *rathe-sthā-* 'in curru stans' (of one military arm<sup>1</sup>) [see also § 102]. But Homeric *ἀκοντι-σθης* 'javelin-thrower' obviously equals 'in iaculo stans' (cf. *ἀκοντι-στύς* 'in iaculo stantia': the root-form *sthewā-*), and is parallel with Skr. *rathe-sthā-*. Both terms will have designated members of distinct arms of the military service. True, we are habituated to deriving both from *ἀκοντιδ-* supposed to be found in the verb *ἀκοντίζω* 'iaculor'. A corresponding trio of words is found in *δαρίζω* 'I chat with', *δαριστής* 'a familiar friend', *δαριστύς* 'fond discourse'. But *δάριζε* is of pellucid analysis in Z 516, *ὅθι ἢ δάριζε γυναῖκί* ("where he had dallied with his wife", Lang, Leaf, Myers), viz.: as a compound of *δαρι* (loc. to *δαρ* 'socia, uxor') + *ίζω*<sup>2</sup> 'I sit', and the original first sense of *δαριστής* (*δαριστύς*) must have been 'apud socium stans' (. . . 'stantia'). In signification, *δαρος* 'col-loquium' (: *ser-mo*) may be earlier than *δαρ* 'colloquens'. Having this analogical pattern for *ἀκοντίζω*, we need not assert formal analogies as found in *ὀπλίζω* : *ὀπλιστής* (late), *σχιστός* : *σχίζω* (root *σχιδ-*), *ἐριστός* : *ἐρίζω*.<sup>3</sup> [See also § 102].

<sup>1</sup> See for 'stare' in military contexts Lewis and Short, s. v. *sto* I B 3; Liddell and Scott, s. v. *ιστημι* A; PW<sup>1</sup>, s. v. *sthā*, 3. For *stare* of servants cf. neque pueri eximia facie stabant (C. Gracchus, ap. Gell. 15, 12, 2), considered in the light of Horace's ad cyathum statuatur (C. 1, 29, 8).

<sup>2</sup> Probably shortened by haplogy in the pre-Greek from \**ῥαρ[ι-σ]ι-σδω*.

<sup>3</sup> It is curious to note that *αἰχμητής* 'spearman' may have started, if Prellwitz<sup>2</sup> has correctly derived it from *aiḡsmā*, as \**aiḡsmā(y)-sthā-s* 'in pilo stans' whence, with *s*-dissimilation in the posterius -[s]*sthā-s*, *αἰχμη-τής*. In *αἰχμη-τά* we have a nominative of the *agri-cola* type (from *-sthā-*).

80. In Lat. *media-stinus*, the name of a servant of mid degree, the earliest form of record seems to be *mediastrinus* (Lucilius and Cato ap. Non. 143, 4-8). But the earlier form I believe to be, in this case, the less original. If the *r* was not foisted upon the word by imitation of the *-aster-* of *oleaster* (? a rustic way of saying *olea sterilis*)—cf. *parasitaster*, a pejorative of *parasitus* in Terence—it may have got into it proethnically, cf. Av. *raθaē-štar- raθaē-štā-*, Skr. *savya-ṣṭhār- / savya-ṣṭhā-*, wherein like Sommer (IF. 11, 17 sq.) I see the modification of *-sthā-* in the direction of the *-tor-* suffix. Similarly a *\*medhyā(y)-sthā-* may have given *\*medhyā(y)-sthor-*. I suppose original Lat. *mediā-stinus* 'in media (parte) stans' to have been affected, possibly, by this *\*media-sthor-*. As *mediastinus* describes a servant by his relative rank, OBulg. *ogni-stī*<sup>1</sup> 'mancipium' describes him by his special function as fire-builder (so, in substance, Miklosich). For another possible interpretation of *ogni-* see Fay, KZ. 45, 122.

81. As a counter term to *πενέ(σ)στης* we have Skr. *apnaḥ-sthā-s* 'gutsherr'<sup>2</sup>, with a reintroduced *h* (from *s*); add Elean *τελε(σ)-στᾶ* 'magistrate'. So OBulg. *staro-sta* 'village-head' may be neither a superlative as Miklosich seemed to think (Wtbch., p. 320), nor an abstract (cf. Ital. *podesta* from Lat. *potestas*, Eng. *majesty*, the *authorities*) as Brugmann teaches, but a compound of *staro-* (neut. *-es* stem) quasi 'firmum' + *st(h)ā* 'sistens'. In Homic *θεμιστεύω* we have a verb from *\*θεμι(σ)στεύς* 'fas-stator'<sup>3</sup>, and as Schulze has already surmised (see KZ. 42, 242, fn.) the flexion of *θεμιστός* (gen.) is to be explained by composition of *θεμι<s>-* with a posterius from *sthā-*. Productive as the ending *-εύς* was in Greek, no mere productivity seems quite to account for pairs like *ἀριστοι* and *ἀριστῆες* 'principes', *ἀγχιστος* and *ἀγχιστεύς* 'proximus heres'. Here, where the superlatives have *-stho-* (see § 43), their co-ordinates have *-sthāw-* (cf. Skr. *sthāvarā-s*, § 4), and in the *η*-dialects their plural ended in *-στη(F)-es*. From *βασι-λῆες*: *βασι-λεύς* (*-lēw-s*, see Class. Quart. 5, 119; IF. 29, 417) pairs like *ἀριστῆες*: *ἀριστεύς* were developed. Germ. *fürst* 'princeps' and

<sup>1</sup> Here *-stī* is of transitive force; see §§ 81, 105.

<sup>2</sup> The rendering *opi-plenus* were perhaps more accurate. To the Roman scholars (cf. e. g. Servius ad Aen. 1, 646) *plenum esse* was a current definition—accurate, too, to all intents and purposes—for *stare*. In Aen. 6, 300, *stare flammae* (for this is the MSS. reading) is for *plenum esse flammae*; cf. exx. in § 81, fn.

<sup>3</sup> Or perhaps 'fas-canens', see § 17 for *st(h)u-*.



Skr. *pra-stha-s* 'Vordermann' both = *prae-stans*, while Av. *fraē-šta* 'nuntius', with prius = Lat. *prae-*, came to mean 'one who stands for another, his representative', unless *-šta* has causal force here (cf. exx. in § 19).

82. Like *apnaḥ-sthá-s* 'gutsherr' is Latin *scele(s)-stus* which every student of Plautus knows to mean 'scelerum dominus, scelera sistens/scelerum compos, scelerum plenus'. The same analysis suits *honestus*, *modestus*, *robustus* (but see § 51), and secondary *mōlēstus* 'mōlem sistens'. It is not clear whether in Skr. *sthá-pati-s* 'loci dominus' the prius means 'locus', i. e. 'stand, stop, halt; settlement' (see § 14) or corresponds with Skr. *sti-* 'clientela' in meaning. The type of *scelestus* is represented in Greek proper names like *Θνέστης* 'sacra sistens', later = *δοιδυξ*. The late words *ἀρεστῆς*/*ἀρεστήρ* are probably translations of Lat. *placenta*. [The proper names *Μενεσθεύς* (on *-εύς* see § 81), *Μενέσθης*, *Μενέσθιος* show *θ* not *τ*, and are all compounded with *μέγες* 'vis', as *scele(s)stus* with *sceles-*. Formally cf. Skr. *mana(s)sthas* 'in corde habitans'].

83. In Latin *sospes* I also recognize a *sti-* to correspond with Skr. *sti-*, while the ending *-pet-* is from *-pat-*: Skr. *pā* 'protector' (in *sti-pā* 'protector of the *sti-*'). I derive *sospet-* from *swo-sthi-pat-*<sup>1</sup> 'protector of one's own *sti-*'. This accounts for *sospita* as the title of Juno, cf. above on Agni and Mitra-Varuṇa as the *sti-pā*, on Indra as *abhiṣṭi-pā* (§ 78). For the dialectic form *seispita*<sup>2</sup> (Juno) it is necessary to write *\*swoi-sthi*, not *\*swo-sthi*. This dative *swoi-* corresponds with the prius in Av. *xvāē-pati* 'himself' (cf. vulgar 'his self'), which forms a nearly precise counter-term to *\*swoi-sthi* 'sui-clientela'; also cf. OPers. *uvāi-pāšiya-m* 'sui-possessio'. In these compounds the dative (for I agree with Foy in so regarding the Iranian prius) acts the rôle of a possessive, or seems to. It is not a little curious that in English, also, the complexes like *him-self* exhibit a dative prius. So much for *sospes* in its active sense of 'saving'. For the passive sense of 'salvus' it seems expedient to derive from *\*swo-stho/i- + potis* = '(of)-welfare-possessed', cf. with *\*swo-stho*-Skr. *sva-stha*-defined by 'in seinem natürlichen zustand sich befindend . . wohl auf, gesund' (see § 11), and Lith. *savi-stas* 'independent, self-directing,

<sup>1</sup> Possible also is *\*swo-sthi-p-* 'welfare-protecting' with metathesis to *\*swo-spith-*. Cf. the later metathesis in Alb. *štepi-* 'domus' from Lat. *hostipium* (?).

<sup>2</sup> I pass without comment over the derivation of *seis-* from *sīd(o)s*.

self-reliant' (lit. 'selbst-stehend'), cf. Lat. *liber(s)tus* 'frei-stehend' (§ 29). A possible division of the pre-Latin start-form is *swo-sthapoti-s* 'sui potens', with *posterius*=Skr. *sthā-pati-s* (§ 82).

#### INHABITANTS, WANDERERS, STRANGERS.

84. The current interpretation of *caelestis* as 'in caelo stans' (cf. Skr. *divi-stha-*) is not open to doubt, in my opinion, however insoluble the debate whether *e* is long or short. If, with some investigators, we explain the *ē* of *lēvis* and *lēvi* (pf. of *lino*) as from *ēi caelē-* would be normal from *\*caelei*, but I am rather inclined to think the *e* of *caelestis* dialectic. In any case, as a conceptual opposite to *terrēs-tris*<sup>1</sup> (-*es*- stem + *-tri*- 'faring', see Fay, AJPh. 31, 409)—cf. Ital. *cilestro* 'caerulean'—its *ē* was liable to reduction to *ē*. As for *agrestis* it can never be determined whether it corresponded in its *posterius* to *caelestis* or to *terrestris*. That *terrestris* was highly productive is shown by *silvestris*, *campestris*, *vallēstria*, *lanēstris* (cf. *campestre* 'leather apron'), and it is even hard to decide whether *palustris*<sup>2</sup> started from *\*palud-tris* 'marsh-faring' or came by irradiation from *terres-tris* 'dry-land-faring'. In *pedestris* and *equestris* we have adjectives pertaining to subdivisions of the *exercitus terrestris* (Nepos; also *proelia t.*)—a combination possibly attested by Accius when he writes in highly metaphorical language *terrestris pontus strages conciet* (ap. Cic. N. D. 2, 89); cf. *pedestres navalesque pugnae* (Cicero), wherein *pedestres* has replaced *terrestres* (but Cicero has *terrestris archipirata*). Direct derivation from *\*pedet-tris* 'footgoing-faring' *\*equet-tris* seems most unlikely.

<sup>1</sup> The sphere of original usage of *terrestris* is shown by its application in Plautus to *pecudes* and *sus*. By the time of Cicero *terrestris* and *caelestis* had become fixed contrasts in the natural history classification.

<sup>2</sup> The influence of *palustris* has given to *lustrum* 'haunt, place of wandering' the sense of 'bog, swamp', but *lustrum* is from the root found in *ἐλεῖθω* 'eo' + *-tro-m* (as in Skr. *sthā-trd-m* 'standort'—the comparison of which with Lat. *ob-stāculum*, OE. *stodl* 'postis' (Brugmann Gr. II. 1, p. 341) is purely gratuitous). In *lus-trum* the *posterius* may have meant quasi 'erratio' (: the root *ter-* 'to fare', generalized into something like 'haunt'). Cf. also *lustrō* (Naevius) 'errator', and *lustrō* 'erro'. Skr. *sthā-trd-m* is a counter term to Lat. *lustrum*. [Certainty as between *-tro-* and *-tlo-* in words of this meaning is not to be reached, cf. Lith. *bū-klė* 'residence', Lat. *ambulācrum* 'promenade' (both with *-tl-*), but Lat. *cas-trum* 'fundus' (with *tr-*). The *-tl-* forms would show association with the sept. of Germ. *stelle* 'locus'.] *Illustris* is from *\*in-lux-tris*.

85. Other inhabitants are designated by ὄρε(σ)-στιάδες (Homer) 'mountain-dwelling', wherein we have a syncretism of *-sthi-s* (as in *caele-stis*) and *σταδ-* as in *στάδ-α* 'stagnantem' (aquam), see § 5. In ἀγρώ(σ)-στης 'field-dweller' (Soph. Eur.) the prius is a local genitive (§ 28).

86. The posterius is entirely obvious in a word like μετ-ανα-στής 'land-louper' (see Fraenkel, KZ. 42, 262), wherein the sense of 'wanderer' comes from the preverbs (cf. Skr. *pra-sthāv-an-*, § 14). It is equally impossible, because of the intrinsic semantic appeal of the explanation (§ 3), to refuse the explanation of Lat. *hostis* 'stranger' (see Fay, Class. Quart., 1, 28) as from [*e*]gho(s)-st(h)i-s 'extra-stans'.<sup>1</sup> Nor do I pass over Walde's objection that *eḡhs* (whence *ex*) has a palatal and *hostis* a pure guttural, but that is because the *e-* has palatalized<sup>2</sup> the *gh* of *eḡhs*. Certainly a difference between a *k̂-* and a *k-* can no longer be urged against a derivation sound in all other respects, at least not by a scholar who uses the language used by Walde<sup>2</sup>, s. v. *acus*. For the division *ho(s)-stis* OIr. *gall* 'hostis' may be pleaded, for which Stokes-Fick (p. 108) surmise derivation from *\*ghas-los* i. e. *\*ghos-lo-s* = 'ex' + a suffix (?) *-lo-*. Perhaps this *-lo-* belongs to a root *lēy-* 'lie' in Skr. *lī-nas* 'anschiegend, anliegend, geduckt', cf. *lē(y)-gh-* in the kin of *λάχεια* <'low'> lying' (ap. Prellwitz<sup>2</sup>, s. v.). For the pair *\*ghos-lo-s* 'out-lying': *gho(s)-stis* 'out-standing' cf. Skr. *aṅgú-li-s* 'finger' (=on-hand-lying): *aṅgú-ṣṭha-s* 'thumb' (= 'in manu exstans', see Fay, AJPh. 31, 479). The applicability of these names will have rested in the use of the raised (standing) and depressed fingers in counting (see § 31<sup>1</sup>).

87. Let us apply these observations to Skr. *átithi-s* 'guest' Av. *asti-š* 'geselle, genosse' (i. e. 'comer'), and assume that, as in *hostis*, the posterius was *-sthi-s*, and write the two start-forms (1) *\*atisthi-s* and (2) *\*atsthis*, wherein *ati-* and *at-* are root-nouns:

<sup>1</sup> Greek ξ-έν-φος is similarly 'extra-in-habitans'. What theory of mere coincidence could explain such conformity of definition to analysis? The yielding in *-φος* of the *es-* to the *o-* stem (cf. *ὅ* and *τὸ σκότος*; ἄγγελος: Skr. *dñgiras-*; the OBulg. cases as collected by Leskien, Hdbch.<sup>3</sup> § 48) need not surprise us in a language where compounds in *-es-* frequently match simplices in *-o-*. [Or is ξ- in ξ-έν-φος from ξF, prevocalic form of ξv- 'co-', § 36<sup>1</sup>?]

<sup>2</sup> After Brugmann's fuller treatment (Grundriss 2, 2, 823) I am now quite willing to admit the *ḡh* of *eḡhs*, but that carries no proof of *ḡh* in *ghos-*, nor perhaps even in *\*eghos* (see § 12 fn.).

the Skr. root *at-* 'errare'. In *ati-* I see a locative 'in erratione', and the derivation of 'guest' from 'in erratione stans' leaves nothing to desire. As in the case of *ξ-év-Fos* 'ex-in-habitans' and *ho[s]-stis* 'extra-stans' the definition is too apt to be referred to coincidence. The second start-form *\*atsthis* may have originated from the first in composition (cf. Bartholomae in IF. 7, 70) and *átithi-s* is found in RV. in four compounds. But *\*atsthi-s* would have two sense elements, *at-* 'errare' and *-sthi-s* 'stans', and according as one of these elements outweighed the other (cf. § 12) the forms (3) *\*asthi-s* (cf. on *asthi* § 67) and (4) *\*atthis* would result. Now all four of these forms might have had a contemporary vogue, for language changes do not occur overnight, and the reaction of (4) *\*at-this* on (1) *\*ati-sthi-s* would have yielded what has survived in Skr. *dti-thi-s*. Perhaps *\*ghosthis*, conceived as *\*ghos-this*, played a part.

#### REMAINDERS.

88. Lat. *pestis* 'pestilence' is from *\*per-st(h)is* 'persistent', and was first an adjective qualifying something like *morbus*, cf. Eng. *epidemic*.<sup>1</sup> In social usage, e. g. *quaedam pestes hominum* (Cicero, *Fam.* 5, 8, 2), the sense of 'persistent' may still be felt. The form *pesestas* (Festus, 258), if not a mere dittography for *\*pestas*, may be a blend of *pessum* + *\*pestas*.

89. Lat. *lōcusta* | *lūcusta* 'locust'. This tree-dweller is named from *lō(w)-co-* 'grove' (: *lēw-* 'caedere', v. Walde<sup>2</sup> s. vv. *luo*, *lucus*) + *-sta* 'habitans'.

90. The analysis of Lat. *astus* as *ak-* + *st(h)ū-s* yields a definition approximately = 'acutē-stantia'. Here *-st(h)ūs* is a root-noun from the *sthewā-* form of *sthā*, while in *a-stūtus* we have a participle to the same root. In *ὠτακουστής* 'listener, spy' we have *ὠτα* (acc. of specification) + *\*ἀκου-στής* quasi 'astutus': that is to say that *\*ἀκου-στής* has in its prius a correspondent of the stem (?) of *acū-tus*, *acū-men*. The complex will equal 'sharp-standing-as-to-the ears', and *-ακου-στής* is only a somewhat preciser *acutus* (cf. *aures* | *capripedum satyrorum acutas*, Horace, *c.* 2, 19, 3). Query: Is the verb *ἀκούω* anything different from Lat. *acuo*, save that *ὠτα* had been lost from its phrase use? The present *ἀκούω* no more proves *\*akou-sy-* than *βασιλεύω* proves an *-sy-* flexion. Per-

<sup>1</sup> I have lived under conditions where an epidemic was usually described by the euphemism "the prevailing",—in derision of a diagnosis supposed to be "official".

haps the -*oŷ*-sept has been derived from (*a*)*k̂-ōw-s-* 'sharpen' by some process of apocope due in part to gradation. A medial stage of this would be indicated by Goth. *h-au-s-jan* 'to hear': κ-ο(*F*)έω. [Cf. Hom. νη-κούστησε 'non-audit'].  
 91. Latin *crusta* (: κρύσταλλος 'ice') contains in *cru(s)-* a cognate of *cruor* 'clotted blood' and *crudus* 'hard' (of unripe fruits); or else of *cor(n)u* 'horn': Av. *sr-v-ī* (§ 45), the *u*-stem being parallel with the *es*-stem of the *kéras*-sept (cf. § 51). The complex meant 'hard-' or 'horn-standing'.

## ADDENDA.

92. For the posterius *-ster-* in Lat. *passer* (§ 13) cf. OHG. *lī-stera* 'thrush', quasi 'leim-streuend', from his plastered nest.

93. OIr. *arsa(i)d* 'vetus', from *paro(s)-stāti-s* (Fick-Stokes 4 p. 37), cf. on Skr. *purastāt* § 15. Lith. *at-stū* 'longe' (i. e. 'dis-stans').

94. Lat. *gurgu-stium* 'hovel', prius *gṛgṛdho-*: Av. *garəda-* 'cave-hut'; *-stium* as in Skr. *pa-stī(y)a-m* (§ 16).

95. [19] Skr. *pada-stha-s* "zu fusse gehend", eig. *stehend*" (P. W.): cf. *pat-lis* 'foot-soldier', possibly with recomposition (cf. § 13) giving *d-t* for *-st-*. For loss of aspiration see § 42 a. We have the same formation (prius *pēd-*) in Lith. *pė-szczias* (*-sthyo-s*) 'pede-iens'. Skr. *mārga-stha-s* in (recta) via stans. OHG. *lī-sta* 'seam' is cognate in both its parts with Ger. *leiste* (§ 64), and both with *leisten* 'foot-track'.

96 [44]. Skr. *bhṛ-gtis* 'top' had an original prius *bhṛgh-*, cognate with *bṛhānt-* 'altus'. For the loss of *ḡ* and retention of *s* see § 12. Lith. *kūp-stās* 'hill, tuft': *kup-rà* 'hump'.

97 [43]. Of the connection of the Greek superlatives with stems in *-es-* I had caught sight in AJPh. 31, 411, § 23. Note the explanation by haplology of ἐλέγχ[εσ]-ιστος 'in culpa stans', κέρδ[εσ]-ιστος 'devoted to gain', κήδ[εσ]-ιστος 'dearest' (= 'in cura stans'), κύδ[εσ]-ιστος 'in gloria stans'; cf. the proper name Μηκ[εσ]-ιστεύς 'Longissimus'.

98 [45]. Lith. *rañ-stis* 'prop, stay'—prius in Skr. *rāmate* *festmacht*'. Perhaps to Lat. *restis*, if from *\*remstis*; cf. *ra-stas* 'beam' (pace Schleicher, Hdbch. p. 115). Homeric πλατάνιστος for πλατάνος 'plane-tree' may owe its *-stos* to some other vegetal growth (§ 47), unless *-stos* = 'stalk', as in *aḡva-ttha-s* (?). By irradiation from *aḡva-ttha-s* (45 fn.) we have Skr. *kapi-ttha-s*



'monkey-tree', *kula-ttha-s* (prius: *kū-la-m* 'copia'?), the name of a pod fruit.

99 [47]. Note the posterius in *κρά-στις/γρά-στις* 'green fodder'.

100 [78 sq.]. SERVANTS AND MASTERS: *ἀγορα-στής* 'market-servant, buyer'.<sup>1</sup> Av. *hāvi-šta-* 'camillus' was literally 'in pre-mendo (sc. "soma") stans'. For the infinitival *hāv-i* cf. Skr. *vāhi-ṣṭha-s* (AJPh. 31, 411, §20). Precisely the same explanation accounts for the so-called superlative *γāj-i-ṣṭha-s* (§43) as for the later *yajña-stha-s* "mit[einem] opfer beschäftigt" (PW.<sup>2</sup>; for the rendering 'beschäftigt mit' cf. PW.<sup>1</sup>, vii, 1280, 3). As a part of speech, *hāvi-šta-* is like Lat. *lanista* (l. s. c. 412, §24 a). Lexical Sanskrit has *pārṣva-stha-s* 'ad latus stans' and *doh-stha-s* 'ad brachium stans' as names of servants. Mlr. *foss* 'servus' is from *upo-stho-s*. It is not necessary to mention transparent formations like Skr. *parame-ṣṭhīn-* 'praeses', *tri-ṣṭhīn-* 'auf dreifachem grunde stehend', but *Διοσξενιασταί* may be given as a representative of the names of members of innumerable Greek commissions and guilds. Hence, by irradiation, a word like Hesychian *ἐθνισταί* 'fellow countrymen'.

101. Because of their formal likeness to a name like *ἀλφη-στής* (§79) we may note *\*ἄλκη-στις* = 'in vigore stans'; (cf. *ἄλκηστής* 'piscis quidam'), *\*Ἀδρή-στη* (? 'in industria stans'), *Γεραι-στός* (a promontory, but also a town with secure harbor) 'in honore stans' (?), *\*Ὀγχηστός* (city on a ridge; also a brook in a gorge) 'in angusto stans' (for vocalism of *\*ὄγχα-* see Fay, §19, fn.). Add. *κληιστός* 'in clave stans'.

102 [79]. A full, if not complete, collection of the Homeric words in *-ιστής* reveals their semantic range. Of genuine *-ζω* verbs—for *-ιστής*: *-ιζω* is a practical group—with *-ζ-* from *-γγ-* or *-δγ-*, Homer, as some one has recently remarked, shows next to no examples. Touching the analysis of *ἀκοντίζω* as *ἄκοντι ἰζω* cf. §522 where *ἰζοντο* = 'insidiabantur', at least by connotation, and the same sense of the same verb is found in Ait. Br. 3, 14, where *tan mṛtyur . . asīdat* = *ei mors . . insidiabatur*. To be sure, *ἀκοντίζω* has gone on in its development of sequel meaning (cf. AJPh. 32, 414 fn.) from 'in (cum) iaculo insidior' to 'iaculor'. Most clear in its composition is *κελητίζειν* (O 679) = *ἐπὶ κέλῃτι ἰζειν*

<sup>1</sup> Is it that *ἀγόρασις* 'emptio' is from *\*ἀγορα-στις* with *-στυ/-σσ-* (so in Boeotian) */-σ-*? Alii alia dixerunt.

'to sit on a horse', used of a rider with a "good seat". It is but an accident that we do not find a \*κελητι-στής like ἐλεφαντι-στής (§ 79); cf. Vedic *hari-ṣṭhā* 'on a sorrel riding'. By irradiation from κελητίζω and its sort came πειρητίζω, a doublet of πειράω. In ἀκοντι-στής, of one *experienced* with the javelin (§ 100), the posterius may have come to connote 'sciens' as also in κιθαριστής (§ 103), helped by οἶων-ιστής (§ 104); cf. ἐπιστάμενος μὲν ἄκοντι (O 282). The group ληι-στής 'robber': ληιστήρ/ληίστωρ (with *r* as in § 80) is to be analyzed exactly as Av. *hāvi-šta-* (§ 100), and ληίζομαι contains a posterius ἴζομαι; cf. the synonymous pair κεραιστής: κεραίζω and, by irradiation, πολεμιστής: πολεμίζω. Military terms under the influence of ἀκοντι-στής are ἀσπι-στής (? prius a locative plural ἀσπ[ισ]ι) 'in scutis stans', κορυ[σι]στής 'in galeis stans', πελτα-στής (? prius πελτα(ι)ς- [cf. παλα(ι)-στή, § 15], or πελτα[ν]ς-, with transitive posterius, § 105; cf. δυνά-στης?). By irradiation, or from standing a bow up to string it, τανυστός 'bow-stretching'. We have -[σ]της, with σ originally lost by haplogy (§ 79, fn.); in κορυνή-της 'club-man', μαχη-τής 'proeliator'; cf. φηλη-τής 'cheat'. On the other hand, τοξότης 'archer' has come by irradiation from ἱππότης, which is for ἱπ[πο]-πότης: Skr. *āva-pati-s* (VS. : as a proper name in Ç Br., cf. Ἱπποτα Νέστωρ), and is not an abstract ("your horsethip", forsooth) any more than Lat. *equet-* is an abstract with *t* representing, thanks to an always compliant gradation, the *-ta* suffix of *senecta*.

103 [79]. A special paragraph among the -ιστής: -ίζω formations in Homer is due to the woman-and-song group. On δαρίζω see above (§ 79). Add κιθαρίζω κιθαρι-στής 'cithar-playing' (on -στής as a musical term see § 20). Sitting and standing are equally suitable postures for the citharist. The prius κιθαρι- is either a locative or the ι-stem, alone known to Homer. As in κρεμβαλια-στής 'clapping for the dance' the prius may have been accusative or accusative and -στυς transitive (§ 105). In μακαρι-ίζω 'I make happy' the posterius is transitive, but μακαρι-στός (Hdt.) 'deemed happy' = 'in laetitia stans'. The prius of ὀρχη-στής | ὀρχη-στήρ 'dancer' was probably locative to \*ορχᾶ 'ordo'. In μνη(σ)-στεύω (see also AJPh. 31, 417 fn.) the prius is a local genitive = 'apud feminam' \*στεύω 'I stand up to' (cf. vulgar "to set up to a woman"); note μνη-στής and μνη-στός, both Homeric. Before leaving the verbs in -ίζω: -ιστής I may note that on this model ἀγοράζω (which might well mean 'to sit at

market', used of a buyer; cf. our 'to go [or be] on the market') has been fashioned to correspond to ἀγορα-στής (§ 100).

104. Finely isolated is οἰωνιστής defined by Capelle-Seiler for N 70 by 'der vogelzeichen kundig' (with θεοπρόπος). It is curious that no one seems to have suspected hitherto that οἰων- is gen. plur. = Lat. *avium*, and that -ιστής is for -Fιστής, cf. ἴστωρ τινός (Soph.) = 'gnarus rei'. The note of skill contributed by -Fιστής may perhaps have passed into words like ἀκοντι-στής (§ 102) and κιθαριστής (§ 103).

105 [82]. The *scelestus* and *apnah-stha-s* types are found in κηδε(σ)-στής 'affinis' (after κηδιστος, § 97), Ὀφειλε(σ)-στής quasi 'Auxilius', ἀργε(σ)-στής 'candefaciens' (sc. ventus). That in such words -στη- may be transitive (cf. ἴστημι) needs no special proof. In a word like ὑβρισται 'insulters' perhaps we do well to start with ὑβρι[ν]-σταῖ; cf. the late example wherein Hesychius (Schmidt<sup>2</sup>, p. 390, 19), probably citing a scholiast, gives us Θεσεύς, χαρισστητής (i. e. \*χαριν-στητής = 'gratiam referens') ἀπάτης λαβύρινθος (Corrige, λαβυρίνθου) φυγῆς, a collection of genitives perfectly clear, albeit in condensed commentary style.

106. REMAINDERS. 1). χηρωστής, prius χηρω- (inst. = sociative, 'cum herede'; cf. for the σ- stem the posterius in Skr. *bhāga-hara-s* = 'parti-hērēs'; for the sense, ἀγχι-στεύς, § 81) + σταῖ. 2). OIr. (*h*)iress 'glaube', from \*parei-sesta (so Fick-Stokes<sup>4</sup>, p. 36). 3). OIr. *eross* 'puppis' from *parei-sosto-* (ib. p. 37). 4). OIr. *eross* 'height' from *pero(s)-stu-* (ib. p. 37). 5). Lith. *aik-sztis* 'campus' (*aik* : Lat. *aequos*?), *aik-sztas* 'spatiosus'. 6). Lith. *eiga-stis* 'gait' : *eigà* 'walk'. 7). Lith. *ap-stūs* 'abundant', quasi 'ope-stans' (§ 81). 8). Lith. *puiký-stė* 'splendor', abstract to *puikūs* 'splendens'. Certainly we should expect, mingled with the abstracts in -ti-, forms in *st(h)i-* (cf. Lith. *auge(s)stis* 'growth' : Lat. *augustus* in AJPh. 31, 417), as explained in § 7 fn. In gradation with *augestis* we have Goth. *wah(s)-stus* 'growth', whence Eng. *waist*, a part of the body.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

### III.—THE GENITIVES -ov AND -oio IN HOMER.

Though -oio is generally assumed to be older than -ov and to represent the main, if not the only, early epic usage, a glance at the poems is enough to show that such a view must rest rather on some pious wish than on any direct inference. As the text<sup>1</sup> stands, the two forms in the narrative of the Iliad<sup>2</sup> without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., are more or less on a par—439<sup>3</sup> -ov as against 492 -oio. Of the 439 -ov, 150 are found *in arsi*, and 107 of these come before a word beginning with a consonant<sup>4</sup>; the other 43 are followed by a vowel, but not all of these can be claimed as -oi', since 10 occur in the strong caesura, where elision is unlikely. There remain 289 *in thesi*; no less than 60 of these are found at the end of the line, and 2 others are followed by two consonants. Thus among the 931 genitives used there are at least 179 examples of monosyllabic -ov metrically fixed; and many of these—such as *ἔξαγ' ὁμίλου, ἔκπεσε δίφρου, πολέμου δ' οὐ γίγνεται ἔρωή*—are neither obviously modern nor easily removable. Provisionally at any rate, -ov must be accepted as part of the old language. The form remains metrically well established, even if we go so far as to take -ov as -o', and -ov in the first four *theses* as -oo.

As will be shown presently, we can hardly take -ov and -ov in this way; but even if we could we should still be forced to assume two distinct genitives. The ending -oio clearly comes from -ooio, and contraction of vowels divided originally by -σ- is scarcely possible, at all events to the extent that would be needed

<sup>1</sup> The Clarendon Press text (recensuit D. B. Monro, 1901).

<sup>2</sup> The books B484-end, Θ, Ι, Κ, Ψ and Ω are tabled apart as "B<sup>2</sup>, etc.", and the rest of the Iliad is called "the Iliad without B<sup>2</sup>, etc." Between the narrative proper and the speeches there are in general so many differences both of metrical and of linguistic convention that separate treatment is always needed—see *Classical Quarterly*, 1908, April, pp. 94 seq., and 1912, Jan., pp. 44 seq.

<sup>3</sup> Neglecting E 21, Z 61, H 120, N 788; N 358, O 670, Σ 242, X 6, 313; also 10 occurrences of *θυμὸν ἐκάστον*.

<sup>4</sup> F is reckoned as a consonant.

to explain the sure instances of *-ov* (nearly 1 in 5).<sup>1</sup> Inscriptions prove that the Attic genitive is a contraction. The Homeric *-ov* may conceivably be the same; but if so, it must come not from *-o(σi)o*, but from *-o(ι)o*. Even then there may be some difficulty in explaining why, as against other analogous forms<sup>2</sup>, *-oo* is nearly always contracted.

For, as a matter of fact, *-ov* is nearly always monosyllabic. Outside the exceptional scansions like ἀδελφείοῦ κταμένοιο there is only one reason for attempting to resolve *-ov*. The introduction of *-oo* would convert a number of fourth-spondaics<sup>3</sup> into greatly preferable dactyls. But any such attempt recoils on itself, and really spoils rather than helps the versification. For instance, in the Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc. (narr.) the resolution of *-ov* (types Μενελάοο, φαινόο, δίφροο, etc.) would remove 79 out of the 441 fourth-spondaics. So far, excellent; but unluckily there are in the same narrative no less than 51 lines where *-ov* is shortened in the fourth-dactylic (types πολυδαιδάλου, etc.), so that if *-ov* is to reckon as *-oo*, 51 elisions must be added to the 105 which the text already gives in this break. Reducing the fourth-spondaics by 2 in 11, we shall increase the bucolic elisions by 1 in 2—a distinctly poor bargain. Elision such as of *-o* is everywhere kept down, and in an important verse-pause could occur very seldom, if at all.<sup>4</sup> A similar point is to be seen in trochaic *-ov̄*. In the Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc. (narr.) *-ov* is shortened 6 times in the weak caesura (E 338, N 211, P 611, 697, Σ 575, T 384), but only thrice in the fifth trochaic (A 328, M 447, P 277). It is surely very odd that *-oo* should add 6 to the 26 good examples of elision in the weak caesura, but only 3 to the 275 in the fifth trochaic; whereas, if *-ov̄* is taken as a shortened vowel or diphthong, the occurrences of the scansion are closely in accordance with the general metrical chances (Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., narr.—3d-troch. shortenings 112, 5th-troch. shortenings 66). Lastly, the decisive fact is this: The general

<sup>1</sup> I. e. at the very lowest, and on the most extreme assumptions; really it is far commoner.

<sup>2</sup> Instances like the verbs in *-άω* do not help here; there may really have been a conjugation in *-αμ*.

<sup>3</sup> Especially II 647; in later work (narr. Θ 120, ψ 323; speeches T 412, κ 492, 565, λ 90, 165, μ 267) the molossus is no great matter. P 572 shows that molossal words, like the others, really took *-ov*.

<sup>4</sup> Of course, this applies in full force only to narrative, though even in the speeches the bucolic is very well treated.



nature of the verse puts some premium on words which scan as a dactyl (e. g. δῖφροο), or better still, as an admissive dactyl (e. g. ᾤμoo). Any common words of this kind will be often used,<sup>1</sup> and a fair proportion of the instances will stand after the fourth diaeresis. If -oo really existed, it is a quite unthinkable paradox that for the whole of the two epics the dactylic scansion can only be proved once—in a late speech (§ 239). From all this we can draw a plain inference. The genitive in -ου is original in Homer; it was really used, and was pronounced as a monosyllable. It has nothing to do with -oo and still less with -οιο, but was most likely the diphthong -ου, not -οι, or -ει, as can be seen from the dislike of short scansions, which are rarely employed except in open cretics such as θρόνον, etc. Against this view of -ου there are only two apparent objections. The Attic contracted -ου is sure to be felt as a disquieting difficulty, though for the question of Homeric use the fact is extrinsic and not at all *in pari materia* with direct metrical evidence. Intrinsic, and therefore much more important, is the high percentage of fourth-spondaic -ου, which by itself would strongly suggest a dibrach form. The puzzle, however, is not quite so easy. To get any solution at all the Homerist will find that he 'must take the matter pretty deep'. At all events, the abundance of fixed -ου, and the absence of certainly resolved scansions, should warn us that we cannot get, and therefore ought not to need, any help from -oo.

Between -ου and -οιο there seems to be no easily traceable difference of function. That the local use ('sphere-within-which') always takes -οιο,<sup>2</sup> can hardly be more than an accident. The earliest example is πεδίοιο, and for this type of word the general rule is against -ου in any combination; the local use of -οιο in other types may sometimes (as in νειοῖο) be due to direct imitation, and sometimes to metrical convenience—e. g. ὁδοῖο replaces κέλευθον when πρήσσοντε shifts to πρήσσωμεν. Again, phrases like ἀφνειὸς βιότοιο prove nothing as regards the syntax of -οιο; they illustrate a principle which has become merely scansional. But though the sense of the endings cannot be distinguished, there can still be seen a difference which in a way is grammatical. The ending -ου is, as the text stands, greatly preferred with pronouns. In

<sup>1</sup> It is just this consideration which makes the rarity of type χεῖρεσι so fatal to the assumption of an early dative in -εσι (side by side with -εσσι).

<sup>2</sup> H. G<sup>2</sup>, p. 143.

the Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., there are 38 narrative occurrences of τοῦ *in arsi* and 29 *in thesi*; τοῖο has at most 7 instances.<sup>1</sup> It is true that in the text τοῦ is often possible; but against this must be set the fact that it is hardly ever necessary—for instance, τοῖο δ' ἄρα κλ. (πρ., στ., etc.), does not occur, and τοῖο γάρ is not found till κ 57 (a speech); the only reliable examples of τοῖο in narrative are τοῖο ἀνάκτος, τοῖο γέροντος, where the use of the article is presumably Odyssean. The same leaning to -ου can be seen in other pronouns. The relative οἷο<sup>2</sup> does not occur, and the possessive οἷο appears only once in the Iliad (Γ 333). The genitives ἄλλου, κείνου, οἷου,<sup>3</sup> τοῖου, τοιούδε, τοιούτου, τοῦδε and τούτου have no corresponding long forms; and αὐτοῦ is thrice as common as αὐτοῖο.<sup>4</sup>

In nouns and adjectives -οιο is the normal use, except where it conflicts with a metrical rule. Every reader of Homer must have been struck by the fact that the ending is never dovetailed—that is to say, there are no<sup>5</sup> phrases such as χαλκοῖο στεροπή, θυμοῖο κρατεροῖο, ἰοῖο πτερόεντος, οἷστοῖο στονόεντος, δι' ὁμοιο στιβαροῖο, ἀπ' ἄντροιο γλαφυροῖο, κυδοιμοῖο κρυεροῖο, Ὀλύμποιο νιφόεντος, ὁμίλοιο προπάροισεν, though *a priori* these would seem to be true and even laudable scansions. In the same way, hiatus after -ου *in thesi* is far too rare<sup>6</sup> to let us think that -οι' appeared in old work. Taken together the two facts show that though with nouns and adjectives -οιο was the regular genitive, yet its prerogative was strictly tempered to the general needs of the verse. Whenever a word naturally gave -οιο, this form

<sup>1</sup> A 493, Λ (261 τοῖο δ' ἐπ' Ἰφιδάμ.), 322, 620, Π 472 μέν, 505 δ', 587, Φ 255.

<sup>2</sup> οὐ H 325, I 94; A 6, ε 4. Speeches—Θ 295; K 244, Ξ 345, P 21, X 425, Ω 744 (?), α 161, (344), (δ 726), π 142, φ 155, ω 52; N 778, Φ 196, Ω (106), 638, 766, (δ 160), θ 539, κ (279, 493), λ 168, ξ 379, σ 181, τ 223, φ 303, (318), ω 310; also B 138, (Γ 87, H 374, 388), Σ 171, (Ω 212), β 27, 90, (γ 140), (ξ 204, π 188), ρ 103, τ 596, ψ 18. Where οὐ τε stands in generalizing clauses, the τε is needed by the sense, and οἷο cannot be substituted.

<sup>3</sup> The gen. sing. masc. (neut.) of ὅσος or τόσος happens not to be used.

<sup>4</sup> αὐτοῖο—A 360, 500, E 170, I 193, P 300, Ω 126, η 143; also N 159, Φ 582, (speech α 207). The 'false' prepositions generally take αὐτοῖο, for a metrical reason, e. g., αὐτοῦ προπάροισθε (πρόσθε) gives overlength, whereas πάροισθ' (πρόσθ') αὐτοῖο gives true scansion.

<sup>5</sup> In the whole of the two epics the single exception is I 126 = 268 (speech); but ι 393 and φ 98 must be considered.

<sup>6</sup> In the Iliad, only E 666, (Θ 120), K 505, Π 226, (Ψ 219, 431), Ω 122, 578; speeches (Z 463), O 23, Ψ 441.

was preferred to -ου, and the preference went so far that actually *Οὐλύμποιο*<sup>1</sup> was normal as against *Ὀλύμπου*. But in any word that would give -οιο (e. g. *δίστοιο*) the ending -ου has a prescriptive right. In early work this rule seems to have been quite absolute; we may be sure that if combinations like *δι' ὧμοιο στιβαροῖο* had been used a fair proportion of them would have been preserved, if only because they often have no obvious metrical equivalent.

The rejection of -οιο, then, may be taken as a fact; but it is at first sight a fact rather hard to understand. In a word like *δίστος* the ending -οιο gives, it is true, an open antispast; and this consideration might lead us to expect a preference for -ου. But it does not explain the total rejection of -οιο. *Ὀλύμποιο* was often iktuated; why was not *δίστοιο* sometimes dovetailed (*δίστοιο πτ., στ., etc.*)? Especially in words like *μηρός* the principle seems fantastic; *μηροῖο* is regular, and there are a great number of shifts which would naturally give *μηροῖο* (either *μηροῖ'* or *μηροῖο κρ.* etc.). The whole thing must surely point back to a time when there was for nouns in -ος a third termination still in living use. Let us suppose that in some early epic period—earlier than any represented in our text—the ending -όφι, perhaps already on the down grade, was yet part of the living language, and was still used freely, at all events with prepositions. At once all the puzzling facts of -ου and -οιο fall into line. Except with pronouns, the ending -οιο was preferred, and in such types as *αἰγίοχος, χωόμενος, ἥπειρος, ποιητός, ἄλιος, κολεόν, Πρίαμος*, it was the normal use. But in forms like *δίστος* there was metrical interference: *δίστοιο* would give a spondee which must be felt as gratuitous,<sup>2</sup> since -όφι, possible at any rate with prepositions, would give the required dactylic scansion. The

<sup>1</sup> So too *μεσσαύλοιο* (Λ 548, P 112, 657), as against *μεσαύλου* which does not occur. The converse treatment, viz. a form so iktuated as to preclude -οιο, is late and very rare (Λ 631, κ 389); *κουλεῶν* is not found; *δηϊῶν* stands only once in narrative (P 189), but the speeches give four occurrences (H 119, 174, T 73, Φ 422); in Π 9, *ἀπτουένη ἐανοῖο καὶ ἐσσ.* may be read.

<sup>2</sup> Avoidance of the gratuitous spondee was an important principle, which we can see illustrated in many ways—e. g. the rigorous taboo of augmented forms like *ἤκουσε*, the subtle treatment of forms having interchangeable -σσ- and -σ-, and the restriction of dative in -εσσι from stems with which it would give a spondee. (To this last rule there are many apparent exceptions even in the narrative of the *Iliad* without B<sup>2</sup>, etc.; in B<sup>2</sup>, etc., and in the *Odyssey* -εσσι becomes quite free). The treatment of *ἄνῃρ, ὕδωρ*, and the difficulty in *Οὐλύμπω*, and the rarity of scansions like *ἰδαίζων*, all exemplify the same thing.

occasional need for constructions rejecting *-όφι* would not be enough to bring in *ῥῆστοιο*, for in reserve there was always *ῥῆστοῦ* which at the end of the line could still dodge the spondee. The same principle obviously applies to types *ιοῖνος* and *ἰῶμος*.

We must suppose that this was the original state of things, but in the earliest period represented in our text there is already a difference. The *-όφι* case is evidently on its last legs; and its primitive use, seen here and there as in *πλάγχθη δ' ἀπὸ χαλκόςφι χαλκός*, is for the most part disappearing<sup>1</sup> except where a change was metrically impossible. Still, in the verse as we have it, the older tradition has left three clear traces—the prohibition of *-οιιο*, the massing of certain types of *-ου* and *-ων* (*ἐκ δίφρου, δι' ὧμον, ἐξ ἵππων, ἀπ' ὧμων*) in the fourth spondaic, and the curious fact that the so-called *-οο* was always dovetailed—a restriction which seems to have come about in the following way: Words like *ἀδελφεός* cannot take *-οιο*, so that when a genitive was needed, *-ου* was practically forced; *-φι* would not often be suitable with this type of word,<sup>2</sup> though no doubt when a dovetailing combination was to hand, the ending might be used, and indeed apparently was used in *περιβῆναι ἀδελφεόφι καταμένοιο*. In any but the earliest periods this phrase would be sure to provoke some change, because of the agreement of *-όφι* and *-οιο*.<sup>3</sup> When *ἀδελφεοῦ* was substituted, it is likely that the *-ε* took false length (such as is seen in *σφείων*). After the substitution had taken place, *ἀδελφειοῦ καταμένοιο* became regarded as authorizing<sup>4</sup> a special 'epic' treatment of *-ου*. The formula is 'open cretic, followed by two consonants', and

<sup>1</sup> The corpse-like *-φι* is however galvanized to a sort of secondary life in *-ηφι*. The use apparently is on the rise; in late narrative *-ηφι* is transferred from nouns to pronominal adjectives (*ἐτέρηφι*, Π 734, Σ 477, X 80, *δεξιτερῆφι* Ω 284); in speeches the case extends to true adjectives—*φαινομένηφι, κρατερῆφι*—and now we are well on the way which is later called Wardour Street. The narrative of Λ shows only *οὐδ' ἀφάμαρτε τιτυσκόμενος κεφαλῇφι*, where, though the syntax is a modernism, the position of *-φι* (closing the line) probably represents the vanishing point of the old use. Similarly, in the *Odyssey* *-οιο* steadily drifts to the end of the line.

<sup>2</sup> *-φι* perhaps could not be elided (but see Π 734), and in old work positional *-ν* was avoided, except with back-leaning words (e. g. *δέ* or *τε*). There is a special reason why *ἀδελφεόφιν δέ* and analogues should not occur.

<sup>3</sup> *ἀπὸ πλατέος πνύφιν* and *αὐτοῖσιν ὄχεσφι* were tolerated, but they are not on all fours with *-όφι -οιο*.

<sup>4</sup> All the other narrative instances are so much later than E 21, that they may very well have been modelled on it.

the rule is faithfully observed in narrative, except in B 731, where *κλυτὰ τέκνα* would have been expected, but the Catalogist may have heard the phrase *ὁμοίου πολέμοιο* without the -τ-. With this exception, two consonants or their equivalent are found to follow all the narrative examples,<sup>1</sup> three of which are *ἀδελφειοῦ*, while the other six have -ι-, the vowel which makes false length least difficult. In the speeches<sup>2</sup> matters are very different. All traditional rules are greatly relaxed here, and the style is much more open to innovations. For instance, the late scansion *οῖος* undoubtedly has its home in the speeches, and this fact is important for the question of the genitive, since -οῖο now becomes at any rate conceivable. It is a curious chance, to say the least of it, that any phrase which apparently necessitates -οο should always occur in a speech, so that -οῖο is a quite possible explanation, enabling us to understand examples like B 325 and ξ 239, which *a priori* cannot, and in fact do not, find any parallel in narrative.

These special scansions, then, seem no real obstacle to the view here advocated. Nor need the ictuation *οὐλύμποιο* be any more fatal, though at first sight it looks troublesome. *οὐλύμποιο* gives a spondee just as much as *οὐλύμποι|ο*. How is it that the former is regular, while the latter is forbidden? The question is not hard to answer. While -φι was still in living use, there grew up a sort of rule against -οι|ο. Presently -φι disappeared and with it those dactylic scansions which had been the cause of the rejection of -οι|ο. But -οι|ο was not introduced into epic verse—that would have been sacrilege. Instead, various other spondaic scansions make their entry, and among these we may regard *ἐκ δίφρου*<sup>4</sup>, *ἐξ ἱππων*<sup>4</sup>, and *οὐλύμποιο* as the most typical.

As has been said, whenever the choice lies between -οιο and -ου *in arsi*, the former is preferred. Indeed, -|ου is at first extremely rare with nouns and adjectives, and some of these seem to refuse it altogether; e.g. neither *Ὠκεανός* nor *αἰγίλοχος* give any certain instance.<sup>3</sup> Relatively the commonest occurrence of -|ου is in type *οἶνον*, where no doubt the use has been affected by *οἶνον*—

<sup>1</sup> B 518, 731, E 21, Z 61 = H 120 = N 788, N 358 = O 670 = Σ 242, X 6, 313.

<sup>2</sup> B 325, α 70, Z 344, I 64, I 440 = N 635 = Φ 294 = σ 264 = ω 543, O 66 = Φ 104, O 554, κ 36, 60, ξ 239 (? add Π 208, i. e. *δου πρότερόν γ'*).

<sup>3</sup> There may be one example of each in the speeches (Ξ 246 and ι 275), but both are followed by a vowel.



at least it is noticeable that type *χρυσοῖο* (where the first syllable cannot so easily get into arsis)<sup>1</sup> is much less often changed to *χρυσ|οῦ*. The general relation of *-οῖο* to *οῦ* in all types can be seen at a glance from the following tables:

## A) -οῖο- 1) Narrative.

		II. (not B <sup>2</sup> , etc.)					B <sup>2</sup> , etc.					Odyssey.							
		1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	(4th troch.)	5th troch.	End of line.	1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	(4th troch.)	5th troch.	End of line.	1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	(4th troch.)	5th troch.	End of line.
	πατροκασιγνήτοιο			I															
	ἀναχαζομένοιο			I															
	περιφαινομένοιο					I													
	ἔξελκομένοιο			I															I
	ναυσικλείτοιο																	I	
type	κvanoπρῶροιο					I						2						3	I
type	ἀποκταμένοιο			3	5													6	
	καταφθιμένοιο										I								
type	ἐϋζῶνοιο			2	9				I	I	I								
type	πολυφλοίσβοιο			I	8					4								2	
type	αἰγιόχοιο		2	18	3	61			6		18			12			6	50	
type	χωμένοιο		2	4		22			2		3			7			I	25	
	σπερχομένοιο							I											
type	ἠπείροιο		2	5	5	12			9		5		I	3			3	14	
	Οἰλύμποιο			7		4			I		2			2					
type	ποιητοῖο		3	6		5					2			I			I	7	
	Σπερχειοῖο			I					I										
type	ἀλίοιο			9	I	8	7		4		2	4			I		I	5	
type	κολεοῖο			36	26	49			7	I	5	9		24			17	25	
type	Πριάμοιο		I	29	9	15			7		3	2		9			I	3	
type	αὐτοῖο			7					4					2			I		
type	οἶνοιο		2	16	2				13		4			11			2	2	
	θείοιο			I	I	7			2		I							12	
type	χρυσοῖο			15	12					4	2			4			6		
type	εἰοῖο		I			5			2		3							I	
type	βιοῖο			3		26			I	I	11					2		25	
	Κρόνοιο					I													
type	τοῖο	3		I	4			2	I		4				I		7		
Totals		3	13	167	1	92	216	2	1	61	2	28	65	1	77	2	58	171	

<sup>1</sup> *χρυσοῖο* is metrically preferential as against *Ιχρυσού*. Compare *στήθεσσι* and *Τρώεσσι*, which are metrically preferential as against *στήθεσι* and *Τρωσί*. A word like *Ιχρυσού* has only one good place, viz. the beginning of the line.

## A) -οιο (cont.)- 2) Speeches.

	Il. (not B <sup>2</sup> , etc.)					B <sup>2</sup> , etc.				Odyssey.					
	2d troch.	3d troch.	(4th troch.)	5th troch.	End of line.	2d troch.	3d troch.	(4th troch.)	5th troch.	End of line.	2d troch.	3d troch.	(4th troch.)	5th troch.	End of line.
type περιφαινομένοιο					2										
type καλλιπλοκάμοιο				I	I										3
type κνανοπρώροιο															10
type ἀποκταμένοιο		I		3					2		2		I		
type καταφθιμένοιο			I											2	
type ἐνζώνιο			3		6									3	
type πολυφλοίσβοιο					4				2					3	
ἐριτίμοιο						(2 in 9th hem.)									
type αἰγιδόχοιο		II		I	46		5		2	17	I	12		8	72
type χωρομένοιο		I	4		12		2			3	I	10		I	18
type ἡπείροιο		I	2		3	3				I		9		5	12
Οὐλύμποιο			4			2				2					
type ποιητοῖο		I	4		3	I	I	3		I			2		
type ἀλίοιο			2		7	3		2		3	I		2		9
type κολεοῖο		I	30		3	25	47		3	I	9	6		16	21
type Πριάμοιο			I3		23	11		6		3	I		11		10
type αὐτοῖο			I									4			
type οἶνοιο			7		I			2	I	2	I		16	I	12
θείοιο					I	2				I				2	13
type χρυσοῖο			2		6	I		I		2	3	I	4	I	8
type ἐοῖο			I			I					I	3	3		13
type βιοῖο			2			15			I		16		7	6	22
Κρόνοιο						2		I							
type τοῖο		I	I		4			I		2					5
Totals	6	88	3	88	149	1	26	3	29	52	6	98	8	90	201

## B) -ov a) in arsi.

	Il. (not B <sup>2</sup> , etc.)			B <sup>2</sup> , etc.			Odyssey.		
	Narr.		Speech.	Narr.		Speech.	Narr.		Speech.
	Before cons.	Hiatus in strong caes.	Other hiatus.	Before cons.	Hiatus in strong caes.	Other hiatus.	Before cons.	Hiatus in strong caes.	Other hiatus.
περιτελλομένων	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...
type χρυσηλακάτου	1	...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...
type ἀποικομένων	1	1	5	1	...	...	3	...	1 1 1
περιπλομένων	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...
type οἰζυροῦ	2	1 1	1	2	3	1	...	2	...
type πολυκμήτου	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1
type αἰγυόχου	6	2 4	1	3	2	...	1 1 II	2	6
type χωμένον	5	3 1	1	...	...	...	1 4	1 3 13	5 4
type φθεγγομένων	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	3 1
type ἡπείρου	4	...	3 1	2	1	1	1	2 9	4 4
Οὐλύμπου	? 2	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...
type Πατρόκλου	1	...	2 1	2	1 1 1	...	1	...	...
type ἁλίου	1	...	3 1 1	1 2	2	...	2 1 1	7	1
type κολεοῦ	11	...	8 9	1 7	3 1 2 4	1 1	19	1 4 8	...
type Πριάμου	4	1 3	5 1 1	2 1	...	...	2 1	...	6 2
type αὐτοῦ	3	...	2	1	2 1	...	3 1 2	5	1
type οἶνον	11	...	2 4	1	3 1	7	3	...	12
type χρυσοῦ	3	2 1	1 2	2	1 5	1	1	1 6	1 1
θείον	...	...	1	...	1	...	2	2 1	...
type εἰοῦ	2	...	2	2	3	2 2	2 1	...	5
type βιοῦ	8	...	2 7	2	3	1 4	7	2 12	...
type Κρόνου	4	...	6	...	...	2	1	...	1
οὐ	1	...	3	...	1	3	...	4	...
type τοῦ	39	...	14	1 II	3 6	2 19	4 33	...	...
τοῦδε	...	...	5	...	...	1	...	7	...

## B) -ου (cont.) b) long in thesis.

	Il. (not B <sup>2</sup> , etc.)					B <sup>2</sup> , etc.					Odyssey.				
	Narr.			Speeches.		Narr.			Speeches.		Narr.			Speeches.	
	1st thesis.	2d thesis.	3d thesis.	4th thesis.	End of line.	1st thesis.	2d thesis.	3d thesis.	4th thesis.	End of line.	1st thesis.	2d thesis.	3d thesis.	4th thesis.	End of line.
ἀργυροῦλον					2										3
χαλχοπαρῶν					3									1	
type Πρωτεσιλάου					2					1					1
type Πατρόκλου				1	1					1					5
type Μενελάου <sup>1</sup>			27	4					8	3			10	3	10
type Ὀλύμπου <sup>2</sup>			24	22					9	6			7	5	7
type αὐτοῦ	1	1	14	11	1	1			5	6			2	2	21
type οἶνου	15	2	11	15	9	2		2	3	5	2		1	4	6
type σκῆπτρου	3	1								2					
τοιούδε					2										
οὐ	1				2									6	1
type τοῦ	5	6	15	4		2	5	3	1		1	5	2		
σφού		1												4	7
τοῦδ <sup>3</sup>															1

## C) -ου- a) dactylic.

	1st dact.	2d dact.	3d dact.	4th dact.	5th dact.	1st dact.	2d dact.	3d dact.	4th dact.	5th dact.	1st dact.	2d dact.	3d dact.	4th dact.	5th dact.
	1st dact.	2d dact.	3d dact.	4th dact.	5th dact.	1st dact.	2d dact.	3d dact.	4th dact.	5th dact.	1st dact.	2d dact.	3d dact.	4th dact.	5th dact.
type πολυδαίδαλου				9					1						4
type Περκωσίου		1		2	1				3						4
type ἐκηβόλου <sup>3</sup>				17					10						10
type ἄγριου	4	1		7	3	1			3	1	1			8	1
type φασγάνου	5	4		2	3	15			4	3	4	1		5	
type βλημένου	1								1						
όδοῦ															
type λόχου	2			8		1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	2	
type θρόνου		1	1	6			2	1	3	1		2	1	3	
οὐ								2							
type τοῦ									3						

<sup>1</sup> Including all types of υ υ — —.<sup>2</sup> Including all types of υ — —, but θυμὸν ἐκάστον is neglected (Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., narr. 10 occurrences).<sup>3</sup> Including all types of υ — υ υ.

## C) -οῦ (cont.) b) trochaic.

	1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	4th troch.	5th troch.	1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	4th troch.	5th troch.	1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	4th troch.	5th troch.	1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	4th troch.	5th troch.	1st troch.	2d troch.	3d troch.	4th troch.	5th troch.
type <i>ἑταίρων</i> .....	...	...	I	...	...	...	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
type <i>Μενελάου</i> .....	...	...	I	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
type <i>Πατρόκλου</i> .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	I	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
type <i>αὐτοῦ</i> .....	...	I	I	...	I	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
type <i>οἶνον</i> .....	6	...	3	...	2	3	I	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
type <i>σκήπτρου</i> .....	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
οὐ .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
τοῦ .....	...	I	...	...	I	...	I	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

As has been explained, *-ov* in *thesi* has come about naturally in the historical course of the versification, and is therefore the normal use; but *-ov* in fair competition with *-οιο*, i. e., *-ov* in *arsi*, is at first rare, though it is gradually rising, as may be seen from the following abstract (*οῦ*, *τοῦ*, *τοῦδε*, and *οἶο*, *τοῖο* are neglected;<sup>1</sup> except in the strong caesura *-ov* before a vowel is reckoned as *-οι'*):

		Narrative.				Percentage of fixed -lov.		Speeches.				Percentage of fixed -lov.
		-οιο.	-lov before a con-sonant.	-lov before a vowel in strong caesura.	-lov before a vowel elsewhere.			-οιο.	-lov before a con-sonant.	-lov before a vowel in strong caesura.	-lov before a vowel elsewhere.	
Il. (not B <sup>2</sup> , etc.) .....	483	67	10	33	13.		328	47	6	19	13.2	
B <sup>2</sup> , etc. ....	152	30	5	12	17.5		113	28	2	9	19.7	
Odyssey .....	301	62	6	19	17.5		398	97	16	36	20.9	

The increase in B<sup>2</sup>, etc., and in the Odyssey is very well marked. The speeches of the Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., seem at first sight to rival the oldest narrative treatment of the genitive; but the ap-

<sup>1</sup> The two instances of *Οὐλύμπου* in narrative are not considered; they have been attacked on other grounds, and can easily be removed. But *κατ' Οὐλύμπου τόδ' ἱκάνεις* in speeches is different—*κατ' Οὐλύμποιο ἱκάνεις* can be substituted, and is very likely right, but the hiatus and the gratuitous 5th trochaic *-οιο* are as sure a mark of late work as the double difficulty in *Οὐλύμπου*.



pearance will be found to be quite illusory. In the speeches all trochaic caesurae are relatively more plentiful, and hemimerals are rarer, than they are in narrative, so that there is much less pressure on -οιο. The general treatment of -οιο in the speeches shows an odd difference which may be very important, and like so many things in the handling of this case, may really point back to a primitive condition of the verse. The speeches show the long genitive placed much more in the fifth trochaic. Thus in the Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., the speeches have -οιο actually as often in the fifth as in the third troch. (88 -οιο in 2218 fifth-trochs.; 88 -οιο in 2959 weak caesurae), but in narrative the 3707 weak caesurae give 167 occurrences of -οιο, while the 2703 fifth-trochaics only give 92.

Let us suppose that in early verse the fifth-trochaic was a minor scansion,<sup>1</sup> perhaps even avoided except in as far as it was made indispensable by the needed bacchiacs and amphibrachs which are otherwise troublesome to manage. The consequence is obvious; the only regular appearance of -οιο in the fifth trochaic would be in combinations like πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης (preferred to θαλάσσης ἀτρυγέοιο, εὐρυπόροιο) and ὀλοοῖο φόβοιο, κρατεροῖο βιοῖο, etc. Actually these types seem at first to have been the only regular ones.<sup>2</sup> For instance, it is an odd fact that out of 84 occurrences of words like αἰγιόχοιο (Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., narr.) only 3 are found in the fifth trochaic—A 49<sup>3</sup>, Γ 5, Τ 1. Yet scansions like παρ' Ὠκεανοῖο or καὶ αἰγιόχοιο are so natural that *a priori* they would have been expected everywhere. Again, nothing could seem more inevitable than κατ' Οὐλύμποιο<sup>4</sup> καρήνων, but the phrase is never so placed; and in fact type ἡπείροιο out of 35 occurrences (Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., narr.) gives only 5 in the fifth trochaic, as against 12 in the third troch.; and as many as 16 at the end of the line. Types χωομένοιο and ποιητοῖο are of course metrically debarred from the fifth trochaic;<sup>4</sup> even in the Odyssey they have only two narrative examples (ρ 333, χ 455). Whether type κολεοῖο was at first tolerated in this position is uncertain; in the narrative of Δ

<sup>1</sup> This is well borne out by the narrative statistics for Δ and for Π, and by the facts of the syllabic aug. (Classical Q., 1912, p. 107).

<sup>2</sup> κασιγνήτοιο πεσόντος is indecisive (-ου ἐριπόντος).

<sup>3</sup> A shift from γένετο κρατεροῖο. In the Odyssey, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο at last establishes itself.

<sup>4</sup> Originally the strong caesura unsupported by the 4th diaeresis or (secondarily) by the hephthemimeral was much disliked; and there are hardly any words (ὅ, τό) which would bring in χωομένοιο after the weak caesura.

there is no instance, and all the examples in  $\Pi$  (narr.) are oddly unlucky.<sup>1</sup> To the general avoidance of fifth-trochaic  $-οιο$  in narrative there is only one clear exception, viz., type  $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\iota\sigma$ , which out of 27 occurrences (Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc.), has 12 so placed. The cause lies in the two initial consonants; type  $|\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\iota\sigma$  cannot stand well except at the beginning of the verse, whereas types  $|\acute{o}\iota\iota\upsilon\sigma$ <sup>2</sup> and  $|\acute{\omega}\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma$  can also stand at the end; hence there is a heavier incidence of  $-οιο$  in words like  $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$ , and an extra place is given to the long genitive, to make good the missing place of the short genitive. Something of the same kind can be seen in  $\sigma\acute{\tau}\eta\theta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  (i. e.  $-\epsilon\sigma\phi\iota$ ) and  $\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ , which are normal, because  $\sigma\acute{\tau}\eta\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$  and  $\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota$  have only one good place (first in the line); but scansion like  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  and  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  are highly irregular,<sup>3</sup> since  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\iota$  has three good places and  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$  might have four.

If the reader is satisfied that, though it cannot be traced in the speeches,<sup>4</sup> there was originally some avoidanee of fifth-trochaic  $-οιο$ , he will be better prepared for a fact which must otherwise seem irrational. In narrative there is shown an extreme dislike of  $-οιο$  followed by a particle. The Iliad without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., gives only 5 narrative examples — ( $\Lambda$  261),  $\Pi$  472, 505, where  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$  may be read;<sup>5</sup>  $\omicron$  626, which proves nothing,<sup>6</sup> and  $\chi$  398, a late shift from  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\phi\rho\omicron\upsilon$   $\delta'$  (and this in its turn from  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$   $\delta'$   $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\upsilon\sigma$ —so  $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\phi\rho\omicron\upsilon$   $\delta'$  =  $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$   $\delta'$   $\acute{\iota}\pi\pi\omega\upsilon\varsigma$ ).<sup>7</sup> In the rest of narrative there appear:

<sup>1</sup>  $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$   $\delta'$   $\Psi$  385, 452; <sup>4</sup>  $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$   $\delta(\acute{\epsilon})$   $\Psi$  597,  $\Omega$  18.

$\chi\alpha\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\iota\acute{o}$   $\tau'$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (?) B 672,  $\tau\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\acute{o}$   $\tau\epsilon$  B 735.

$\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\iota\acute{o}$   $\tau\epsilon$  I 661,  $\gamma\acute{o}\iota\acute{o}$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\delta$  801,  $\Sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\iota\acute{o}$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\delta$  845.

<sup>1</sup>  $\Pi$  502 is a speech-resumption;  $\Pi$  589 is in the difficult simile;  $\Pi$  679 is a shifted speech-line (so giving irregular  $-\epsilon\nu$ );  $\Pi$  787, 855, are of course late. The number of other narrative instances must not be taken as decisive—the crossing of  $\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\omicron$  and  $\pi\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\omicron$  may have obscured the principle.

<sup>2</sup> Type  $\acute{o}\iota\iota\upsilon\sigma$  in 5th troch. is rare in narr.:  $\Sigma$  245, T 44,  $\Psi$  387, 859,  $\Omega$  2, 349,  $\nu$  100,  $\psi$  32. In speeches it is commoner—E 887, I 625,  $\Omega$  655,  $\theta$  156,  $\iota$  93, 102, 246,  $\lambda$  350,  $\xi$  170,  $\omicron$  468,  $\pi$  75,  $\sigma$  366,  $\tau$  321, 527.

<sup>3</sup>  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  narr.:  $\Psi$  131,  $\omega$  496;  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  narr.:  $\Sigma$  521,  $\theta$  21,  $\pi$  161,  $\chi$  131, 247, and  $\nu$  432.

<sup>4</sup> In the speeches (and in late work generally) the 5th troch. becomes an important caesura, as can be seen from the occurrence of hiatus, etc.

<sup>5</sup> The question is whether  $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron$  could be used in old work; if it could be used, no doubt it could be followed by a particle.

<sup>6</sup>  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon$   $\delta'$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho$   $\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$  would give Wernecke's scansion, and so would be just as bad as  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\omicron$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  or  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$   $\tau\epsilon$ .

<sup>7</sup> No doubt  $\delta\eta\sigma\epsilon$   $\delta'$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho'$   $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\phi\rho\omicron\upsilon$  is possible, though it is less probable here.

Clearly fresh scansions and fresh particles are making their way in; but the process is slow, and the number of instances inconsiderable, when we contrast the speeches:

τοῖο δ' A 380; τοῖο δ' ἀνευθεν X 333; τοῖό τε Δ 28, Z 283; τοῖο γάρ K 57, γ 334.

Ἄδρήστοιο δ' Ξ 121, Πατρόκλοιο δ' ἔλωρα Σ 93, νεκροῖο δέ Ω 137, Διωνύσοιο δέ ω 74;

Τενέδοιό τε A 38, 452, Πριάμοιό τε A 255, Γ 288, Δ 31, 35, πολέμοιό τε Θ 453, δῆμοιό τε ο 468, π 75, τ 527.

οἰνοῖο τε υ 312, σίτοιό τ' . . . ἡδέ ι 87, κ 58, χρυσοῖό τε α 165, γόοιό τε ρ 8, φ 228, ω 323, θεοῖό τε δ 831, Σάμοιό τε δ 671, ο 29;

κασινγήτοιό γε Ξ 483, Πριάμοιό γε Φ 105, διὲκ μεγάρου γ' δῖω ρ 460;

γούιο μὲν Ψ 157; ποταμοῖό περ Φ 185, καὶ ἐν θανάτοιό περ αἴση Ω 428, 750.

The rarity of such scansions in narrative must surely confirm our former inference. At first, owing to its trochaic scansion, -οιο stood normally in the strong caesura and at the end of the line; where it occurred in the fifth trochaic it was caused by the pressure of needed bacchiacs and amphibrachs—it did not itself cause them. Under such circumstances -οιο could never be followed by particles, since it either stands at the end of the line or in the weak caesura (where elision was at first impossible), or else it is drawn into the fifth trochaic by a bacchiac already existing as such (e. g. θαλάσσης). The reason of the thing must later have disappeared; but by sheer acoustic conservatism the tradition was, as we have seen, well maintained in narrative. Radical innovations, such as Σάμοιό τε,<sup>1</sup> have no doubt been transferred from the speeches, which are always undisciplined.

It has been taken for granted that except in the strong caesura, -ου *in arsi* before a vowel was really elided -οι'. The point cannot be directly proved,<sup>2</sup> but there is a fair probability that -οιο was still elided, or else that -ου was consciously regarded as legitimised by a following vowel. The conclusion gets at least some plausibility from an odd metrical fact. In the narrative of the

<sup>1</sup> Analogous facts are these—*a*) ἐπεσσί τε is rare and late (narr. K 542, τ 415; speeches I 113, δ 597, ι 376) and δχεσσί τε, τέκεσσί τε, etc., are not found; *b*) δόλεσσε δέ (δ 446 speech) has no parallel; *c*) type γέλασσε δέ is later than type γέλασσε at end of line, and much later than type δάμασσε δέ μιν.

<sup>2</sup> At least, not ἀνιδρωτί. The principles of hemimeral scansion seem to be intricate.

Iliad without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., whenever a word forming a spondee fills the gap between 7th and 9th hemimeral<sup>1</sup> (e. g. κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων, ξανθὸς M., πληγῆς αἶοντες, πρηνῆς ἐπὶ νεκρῷ), such a spondaic word either begins with two consonants, or else—well, or else practically it is (ἄναξ) ἀνδρῶν, for there is no other frequent instance. If ἀνέρων is theoretically impossible, nothing can be concluded here; even if the phrase were unique, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν is common enough and old enough to establish any scansion which it really illustrates. But it is a surprising thing that the phrase, though so common and so old, has hardly any analogues or imitations; and we may perhaps provisionally suppose that ἀνδρῶν here conceals ἀνέρων. It is not unlikely that the stem ἀνερ- was declined throughout; otherwise ἰάνερος (e. g. P 435) is hard to understand, and ἄνδρεσσι should not appear at all. The form gives a gratuitous spondee; and just as we see ἦλασε and ἔλασσε, but not ἦλασσε, and ὀπόσα and ὀπόσσα, but not ὀππόσσα, so we should have expected to see ἀνδράσι and ἀνρεσσι, but not ἄνδρεσσι. We may therefore perhaps assume the possibility of ἀνέρων, and in that case the spondees in question become really interesting. In the narrative of the Iliad without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., a huge majority of them begin with two consonants, but the restriction is elsewhere dying or dead, as can be seen from the following abstract:

Spondaic words placed between 7th and 9th hemimerals:

	Il. (Not B <sup>2</sup> , etc.).		B <sup>2</sup> , etc.		Odyssey.	
	Narr.	Speeches.	Narr.	Speeches.	Narr.	Speeches.
A) 2 cons. ....	103 <sup>2</sup>	41	33	15	50	60
B) 1 cons. or vowel. .	22 <sup>3</sup>	35	13	15	28	63

<sup>1</sup> i. e. when both hemimerals exist as true scansional breaks, and neither of them is modified by a forward-leaning word (ἐκ δίνης) or a back-leaning word (πολλὰς δέ).

<sup>2</sup> A 102, 130, 245, 285, 460, B 100, 369, 411, 423, 477, Γ 36, 118, 123, 145, 384, Δ 153, 183, 188, 210, 283, 311, 356, 368, 463, 480, 497, 519, E 8, 74, 91 (?), 158, 427, 500, 537, 623, 697, 780, Z 63, 320, H 93 (?), 107, 322, 405, 479, Δ 107, 125, 126, 153, 177, 238, 294, 532, 846, M 207, 286 (?), 392, 456, N 10, 215, 564, 654, 763, Ξ 31, 41, 150, O 543, 574, 577, Π 3, 285, 310, 413, 508, 579, 600, 752, P 6, 18, 55, 67, 113, 124, 300, 578, 618, 673, 684, 747 (?), Σ 250, 310, 322, 390, (591), 612, T 282, 367, Υ 41, 173, Φ 118, 435, X 467, 469, 470.

<sup>3</sup> (A 35), A 307, 441, 585, B (143?), 169, Γ (119), 375, (380), Δ (472), (E 54, 446), Z 304, 312, H 317, 366, Δ 255 (?), M 397, N 536 (?), Ξ (346), 430 (?), O 525, 632, Π 175, 180, 602 (?), (P 658), Σ 526, T 359, Υ 68, (279=Φ 69), Φ (246), 526.

In the above table the reckoning is made by occurrences; if distinct words (or combinations) should alone be counted, these figures must be substituted:

	Il. (Not B <sup>2</sup> , etc.).		B <sup>2</sup> , etc.		Odyssey.	
	Narr.	Speeches.	Narr.	Speeches.	Narr.	Speeches.
A) 2 cons.....	36 <sup>1</sup>	17	19	10	26	37
B) 1 cons. or vowel..	17 <sup>2</sup>	25	13	12	17	44

It will be very difficult to get sure exceptions in the oldest narrative; ἡδέ in Δ 255 (ἡδὲ ποτόλεμοιο) may really be forward-leaning, and there is the same doubt about ἰθύς in Π 602 (μένος δ' ἰθύς φέρον αὐτῶν). In the narrative of E and P there are no clear instances of spondaic words so placed unless they begin with two consonants. The half line Διὶ μήτιν ἀτάλαντος may perhaps seem enough to disprove the principle suggested; but there is a curious uncertainty here. Long -ι- in this declension may very well be a primitive form, but for some reason it always occurs in late work (e. g. βλοσυρώπις), and generally in connection with speeches (βοῦν ἦνιν, βοώπις). Also, if Διὶ μήτιν ἀτάλαντος is to be an old narrative phrase, we may fairly ask why does it not appear in old narrative? Precisely the same question applies to θεόφιν μήστωρ ἀτάλαντος. Both expressions are really native to the speeches; and, like τόξων ἐν εἰδῶς, have later been transferred to narrative.

'Well', the reader will say, 'provisionally, and for the sake of peace and quiet, the principle may be granted. But what is to be the reason of it, and how is it to bear on -ου and -οιο?' The reason is simple enough? Spondaic words beginning with two consonants are scansionally troublesome. If they are not restricted to the beginning of the line, they must be placed across a diaeresis (κρεῖλων); otherwise, besides necessitating two spondees, they will give either a dovetail *in thesi* (e. g. Η 189 γυνὴ δὲ κλήρου) or

<sup>1</sup> βρίση (?), Γλαύκων, γλώσσαν, δριμύς, δεῖσαν δ', θνητῶν, Θρηκῶν (?), θρήνυς, (κλειτήν), κλήις, κνίσση, (Κνώσω), κρείων, (κρείων), κρήνη, κτήσιν, ξανθός, πλείστοι, πλεκτήν, πληγῆς, πνοίη, πρηνής, πρηών (?), πρόσσω, πρῶτος, ῥίζαν, Σκαίαι, σκῆπτρον, σκώληξ, σκῶλος, σταθμοῖς, στῆθος, Ταῶες -ας -ων -σιν, Τρωαί, φθογγῆς, χλωρόν, χρυσέος, ψυχάς. The phrase ὅτ' ἐπιβρίση is reckoned as ὅτε τε βρίση, and (ὡς τε) πρῶν ἰσχάνει as πρῶν ὕδατ' ἰσχει.

<sup>2</sup> αἰχμῆς (ἄνδρα, ἄνδρας τ', ἀνδρῶν), (ἄτος), (οὐ βουλῆς), (ἐκ δίνης), (ἡρᾶθ' ὁ γερ.), ἡδέ (?), θείου, ἰά, ἰθύς (?), ἰφι, καὶ μιν, καὶ οἷσ', (καὶ σπλάγχν' ἐ-), καλή, (κοίλας), κούρη, λαμπρόν, μήστωρ, μήτιν, (νηός γ' ἐ-), (ὑπὲρ νώτου) οὐ πω, οὐ τι, (παῖς ἦν), πείραν τ', (τὸ πρὶν γ' ἐ-), χερσί.



else over-length (e. g. *καὶ|Τρώων*). With words like *ξανθός* the case is much the same; once within the line, they will not scan well except across a diaeresis—for instance across the fourth diaeresis, because though it is late in the line for a spondee, a dovetail<sup>1</sup> in the hephthemimeral is a primary scansion, and was especially liked. Words such as *δῖος* or *αἰνός* have no analogous difficulty; in any but the fourth foot they can take their natural place—viz., with the first syllable *in arsi*. Hence we find regularly *ξανθός Μενέλαος* or (*βοήν*) *ἀγαθός Μενέλαος*, but not *δῖος Μενέλαος*, nor even *αἰνός Πολύφημος*.

At last we get back to the elision of *-οιο*. We have seen that *-|ου* was originally avoided, and also that a spondaic word not beginning with two consonants could hardly stand between 7th and 9th hemimeral. It is not likely that both principles would be neglected at once; and it can scarcely be an accident that when spondaic genitives like *ὑπνου* and *θείου* are placed before the 9th hemimeral, they are followed either by a back-leaning word (which practically removes the break in question—β 358, ι 97, λ 110, μ 137), or else by a vowel—κ 519, γ 279, φ 69, 526, β 259, δ 839, φ 244, and perhaps ψ 16, 22. If *θείου βασιλῆος* (δ 621, π 335) does not represent *θείοιο ἄνακτος*, it gives final emphasis to the fact that the genitive of *θεῖος*—presumably because the use of the word is Odyssean—hardly ever shows a strictly normal scansion—I 214, κ 315, π 798. Except in these three lines, *θείοιο* stands either in the fifth trochaic (π 230)—an arrangement which in the Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., has only two narrative parallels (τ 44, ζ 245)—or else it stands at the end of the line.<sup>2</sup> This last use is quite irregular, since a bacchiac (or molossus) could originally stand at the end of the line only if it began either with a vowel or with two consonants (*ὑσμίνης, πλήξιππον*). In the Odyssey exceptions become very common, and give several other instances in *-οιο* (narr. β 431, ε 265; speeches θ 232, ι 196, 346. It is fair to conclude that in the narrative of the Iliad (not B<sup>2</sup>, etc.), *θείοιο|* is an importation from a later style, especially as a well-marked feature of that later style is the uneasy conviction that *-οιο* stands most safely at the end of the line (Il. without B<sup>2</sup>, etc., narr. 44 per cent.; Odyssey,

<sup>1</sup> e. g. *κίε ξανθός Μενέλαος*.

<sup>2</sup> Narr. B 335, I 218, Λ 806, N 694, O 333, P 199, T 279, Υ 145, β 394, γ 398, δ 799, ε 198, ο 63, 554, π 53, ρ 3, υ 248, 283, φ 189, 432; speeches O 25, T 297, β 233, δ 682, ε 11, λ 238, ο 313, 347, ρ 230, 402, σ 417, υ 298, 325, φ 74, ω 151.

narr. 55 per cent.). Terminal *θείοιο* has probably supplanted *μεγαθύμου*, for, as the reader will see from the tables, there is a puzzling shortage of this type at the end of the line.

In the *Iliad* the relation of *-οιο* to *-ου* is still a rational problem ; in the *Odyssey* it degenerates into a mystery. The ending may thus afford a high satisfaction both to unitarians and to those who take a different view. Unitarians see how in his latest manner Homer triumphantly freed himself from painful conventions, the legacy of that unrecorded versification which he could not claim to be 'all his'. Other people see—but there is no need to detail what they see. Some hint may be given by the present jottings, elementary enough, but even so perhaps *φωνᾶντα* to separatists.

J. A. J. DREWITT.

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD

IV.—NOTE ON SATYROS, LIFE OF EURIPIDES,  
OXYR. PAP. 9, 157-8.

The use of magic in affairs of the heart is almost as old as Cupid himself, and—to judge from cases now and then reported in the daily press—as little in danger of lapsing into innocuous desuetude.

But the value of magic in this important department of human activity was flatly denied at a very early date. The most famous example in the surviving literature of Greece and Rome is the *Andromache* of Euripides. In this play *Andromache* is accused by *Hermione* of using love-potions to alienate the affections of her husband, *Neoptolemus*. She denies the charge, and, among other things, says in substance that in this particular case the plaintiff can blame no one but herself, inasmuch as the only love-potions capable of holding one's husband, the only love-potions any woman needs for that purpose, are not loveliness of face and form, but loveliness of mind and heart. The passage in question—I borrow Dr. Way's version—is as follows (205):

οὐκ ἐξ ἐμῶν σε φαρμάκων στυγεί πόσις,  
ἀλλ' εἰ ξυνεῖναι μὴ 'πιτηδεῖα κυρεῖς.  
φίλτρον δὲ καὶ τόδ' · οὐ τὸ κάλλος, ὦ γύναι,  
ἀλλ' ἀρεταὶ τέρποναι τοὺς ξυνεννέτας.

Not of my philtres thy lord hateth thee,  
But that thy nature is no mate for his.  
That is the love-charm: woman, 'tis not beauty  
That witcheth bridegrooms, nay, but nobleness.

Of course, we are not to suppose for an instant that *Andromache* sets no value on beauty. On the contrary, she is fully alive, if not acutely sensitive, to the value of it, not only because she is a woman and (at least spiritually) a Greek, but also, and above all, because her opponent is *Hermione*. Her emphatic distinction between outward and inward beauty is not offered as a mere truism in a general way. It has a special application here, a peculiar sting of its own. This is because the plaintiff herself was, beyond all question, a woman of surpassing beauty. All her literary creators unite in telling us so. And do we not know,

too, that she was the daughter of Helen—not to mention the fact that her father was none other than Menelaos, the fair-haired King Arthur of the Homeric epic? But although Hermione inherited much of her mother's beauty, she inherited little or none of her mother's charm. And, like other women in the same situation, she is quite aware that in some way or other her loveliness of form and feature is not adequately seconded by loveliness of mind and heart. Bitterest of all, it is now brought home to her that her victim is also quite aware of it. She deserves a great deal of sympathy. Nevertheless, those of us who are old enough to have observed the part played by temperament in everyday life are probably thankful that we shall never be obliged to live with her.

With Andromache, on the other hand, the balance inclined in the opposite direction. I suppose we must acknowledge that she was not as beautiful as Hermione, or Helen, or some others; indeed, Ovid insinuates—the criticism, however, is purely subjective—that she was too big, that her proportions were too ample. But we are all willing to swear that she *was* beautiful, just the same. Everyone loves Andromache. In fact, the college-boy as I know him—at all events, the college-boy with sufficient taste and intelligence to read Homer and Euripides—is generally ready to stand by her to the last ditch. Only the other day I overheard one of them say to his fellows with great emphasis, 'I just tell you, boys, Andromache was a good sport!' May we not hope—for there are many links between Hellas and Hesperia—that some other friend of hers, some immaterial but kindly ghost, was standing near at the time, and that he has since told her what he heard? If so, and if she ever succeeds in grasping the entire meaning of that compendious but expressive phrase, it ought to warm her heart—even in the realm of dust and shadow.

Like so much else in the dramas of Euripides, the thought expressed by Andromache in the lines I have quoted above is echoed throughout the later tradition, not only of comedy, but also of elegy, of didactic poetry, and even of philosophical discussion.

For example, about a century after Euripides, Menander says (646, K), in a fragment quoted by Stobaios, that—

ἐν ἔστ' ἀληθὲς φίλτρον, εὐγνώμων τρόπος.  
τούτῳ κατακρατεῖν ἀνδρὸς εἴωθεν γυνή.

The one and only genuine love-charm is  
A temper sweet and reasonable. With this  
A wife can rule her husband as she will.

It is quite clear, of course, that we are not dwelling here on the higher levels of language and emotion. Nor ought we to expect it—this is comedy, not tragedy. As it stands, too, this more prosaic echo of Andromache's thought is merely a wise saw. But this is because it has been divorced from its original context. We should have quite a different impression of this passage, if we knew the immediate circumstances by which it was suggested, and what turn was given to the old question of love and magic in which it was originally imbedded. Which, by the way, was the speaker—a man or a woman?

However that may be, 'a temper sweet and reasonable' is a precious possession—to anyone. Indeed, one of Menander's own characters says in another place (Monost. 241) that—

*θεοῦ πέφυκε δῶρον εὐγνώμων τρόπος.*

God gives the temper sweet and reasonable.

But this should by no means discourage those of us who have reason to suspect that we have not received the gift. There is another saying which assures us that—

God helps those who help themselves.

About a century and a half later, the Roman comic poet Afranius, who is known to have been deeply indebted to Menander, says (Frag. 378 R.) that—

*Si possent homines delenimentis capi,  
Omnes haberent nunc amatores anus.  
Aetas et corpus tenerum et morigeratio,  
Haec sunt uenena formosarum mulierum:  
Mala aetas nulla delenimenta inuenit.*

If one might capture men with magic philtres,  
Lovers would swarm round every toothless crone.  
A dainty body, youth, obliging ways—  
These be the philtres handsome women use:  
Old age has none of these—and these are all.

This, too, is merely a fragment, a fragment, however, which was quoted not for its content, but only to illustrate a lexical peculiarity. The original statement of the three necessary qualifications is—

*Aetas et corpus tenerum et morigeratio.*



*Morigeratio*, which I rendered 'obliging ways', clearly connotes such modern terms as 'tactfulness' and 'adaptability'. It will be observed that character, as such, is less important than it was in Menander. The speaker is intensely, one might almost say brutally, practical. I suspect that one reason for the difference was because, unlike Andromache and Menander, he was not thinking of the family circle, but rather of those women whose only hold on their lovers is their power to please. Note, too, that we are looking at the old idea from a new angle. The speaker uses it not as a piece of good advice to lovers, but to illustrate the utter hopelessness and futility of old age in affairs of the heart, another theme upon which Antiquity itself rang all the possible changes, and which appeared again with wearisome regularity in the poets of the Renaissance.

Lucretius says nothing of magic. He does not believe in it; moreover, he is an Epicurean philosopher, seriously and intensely interested in the exposition of his system. But he evidently belongs here, and he emphasizes even more than do his predecessors the things that every plain woman should know. Dryden's version is spirited, but not Lucretius. The woman strongly suggests an English country girl of the seventeenth century, and the husband a rakehelly blade of the Restoration drama, rather than the straightforward Romans whom Lucretius has in mind. I therefore give Munro's prose (4, 1278)—

Nec divinitus interdum Venerisque sagittis  
 Deteriore fit ut forma muliercula ametur.  
 Nam facit ipsa suis interdum femina factis  
 Morigerisque modis et munde corpore culto,  
 Ut facile insuescat te secum degere vitam.  
 Quod superest, consuetudo concinnat amorem ;  
 Nam leviter quamvis quod crebro tunditur ictu,  
 Vincitur in longo spatio temen atque labascit.  
 Nonne vides etiam guttas in saxa cadentis  
 Umoris longo in spatio pertundere saxa ?

Sometimes too by no divine grace and arrows of Venus a sorry woman of inferior beauty comes to be loved ; for the wife sometimes by her own acts and accommodating manners [*morigeris modis*] and by elegant neatness of person readily habituates you to pass your life with her. Moreover custom renders love attractive ; for that which is struck by oft-repeated blows, however lightly, yet after long course of time is overpowered and gives way. See you not too that drops of water falling on stones after long course of time scoop a hole through these stones.

The comparison is a favorite with Lucretius. But one of my feminine friends wonders whether, if it takes so long in proportion to win a man, the man himself would not be too far gone by the time the process was completed to repay one for one's trouble.

Tibullus, who died young and was never married, is willing to stake his all upon personal beauty. When his Delia was accused of winning him with love-philtres, he replies (1, 5, 43) that—

Non facit hoc verbis, facie tenerisque lacertis  
Devovet et flavis nostra puella comis.

'Tis not with words of magic, but with her dainty arms,  
Her golden hair, her features, that Delia weaves her charms.

'That is a new proof', remarks the inimitable Jérôme Coignard when these lines are quoted against him in an argument, 'that women are the sworn foes of knowledge. Hence, the wise man ought to beware of having anything to do with them at all'.

We now come to the poet Ovid. Ovid is not blind to the value of beauty. At the same time, he is keenly alive to the fact that it cannot last. In the two passages, however, with which we are concerned, he has assumed for the moment the didactic attitude, and, like every good teacher, he is quite aware that pessimism is never instructive. And then, too, his nature—he was married three times—was inherently buoyant and hopeful. In his poem, therefore, 'On the Care of the Complexion', after dilating on the importance of attending to one's personal appearance, he says to his class of girls (De Med. Fac. 35) that—

Sic potius vos urget amor quam fortibus herbis,  
Quas maga terribili subsecat arte manus;  
Nec vos graminibus nec mixto credite suco  
Nec temptate nocens virus amantis equae:  
Nec mediae Marsis finduntur cantibus angues,  
Nec redit in fontes unda supina suos,  
Et, quamvis aliquis Temesaea removerit aera,  
Numquam Luna suis excutietur equis.  
Prima sit in vobis morum tutela, puellae!  
Ingenio facies conciliante placet.  
Certus amor morumst: formam populabitur aetas,  
Et placitus rugis vultus aratus erit;  
Tempus erit, quo vos speculum vidisse pigebit,  
Et veniet rugis altera causa dolor.

Love courts you still for these things, not for those herbs of power  
 That some old witch has gathered at some uncanny hour ;  
 These extracts, brews, and simples should all be cast aside,  
 Hippomanes is useless, it never should be tried :  
 They tell us that the Marsi can burst a snake with song,  
 They tell us streams run backward—they lie, or tell us wrong  
 And though those frantic cymbals should cease forevermore,  
 The Moon would still move onward as safely as before.  
 No, ladies, mind your manners—they are your surest arm ;  
 Your mind must help your beauty, if you would always charm.  
 Love fired by that is lasting, your beauty must give place  
 To time, and ugly wrinkles plough up that pleasing face ;  
 'Twill worry you to note them, your glass will vex you sore—  
 Another cause for wrinkles—for worry brings you more !

It will be observed with what skill the Beauty Doctor has adapted the old theme to his special purpose.

Again, on another occasion—this time as a professor in the Art of Love—he gives the following excellent advice to his male students (*Ars Amat.* 2, 99)—

Fallitur, Haemonias siquis decurrit ad artes  
 Datque quod a teneri fronte revellit equi ;  
 Non facient, ut vivat amor, Medeides herbae  
 Mixtaque cum magicis naenia Marsa sonis :  
 Phasias Aesoniden, Circe tenuisset Ulixem,  
 Si modo servari carmine posset amor ;  
 Nec data profuerint pallentia philtro puellis :  
 Philtra nocent animis vimque furoris habent  
 Sit procul omne nefas ! ut ameris, amabilis esto,  
 Quod tibi non facies solave forma dabit !  
 Sit licet antiquo Nireus adamatus Homero,  
 Naiadumque tener crimine raptus Hylas,  
 Ut dominam teneas nec te mirere relictum,  
 Ingenii dotes corporis adde bonis !  
 Forma bonum fragilest, quantumque accedit ad annos,  
 Fit minor et spatio carpitur ipsa suo :  
 Nec violae semper nec ianthina lilia florent,  
 Et riget amissa spina relictæ rosa ;  
 Et tibi iam venient cani, formose, capilli,  
 Iam venient rugae, quæ tibi corpus arent :  
 Iam molire animum, qui duret, et adstrue formæ :  
 Solus ad extremos permanet ille rogos.  
 Nec levis ingenuas pectus coluisse per artes  
 Cura sit et linguas edidicisse duas ;  
 Non formosus erat, sed erat facundus, Ulixes  
 Et tamen æquoreas torsit amore deas :

O! quotiens illum doluit properare Calypso  
 Remigioque aptas esse negavit aquas!  
 Haec Troiae casus iterumque iterumque rogabat,  
 Ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem;  
 Litore constiterant: illic quoque pulchra Calypso  
 Exigit Odrysii fata cruenta ducis;  
 Ille levi virga (virgam nam forte tenebat)  
 Quod rogat, in spisso litore pingit opus.  
 'Haec' inquit 'Troiaest', (muros in litore fecit)  
 'Hic tibi sit Simois; haec mea castra puta!  
 Campus erat', (campumque facit) 'quem caede Dolonis  
 Sparsimus, Haemonios dum vigil optat equos.  
 Illic Sithonii fuerant tentoria Rhesi;  
 Hac ego sum captis nocte revector equis'.  
 Pluraque pingebat, subitus cum Pergama fluctus  
 Abstulit et Rhesi cum duce castra suo;  
 Tum dea 'quas' inquit 'fidus tibi credis ituro,  
 Perdiderint undae nomina quanta, vides?'  
 Ergo age, fallaci timide confide figurae,  
 Quisquis es, atque aliquid corpore pluris habe!

Try no Thessalian potions, give no hippomanes;  
 'Tis labor lost for suitors to turn to aids like these;  
 Not all the magic simples Medea's self could give,  
 Not all the Marsian ditties, can make a passion live:  
 The Colchian had kept Jason, the Wanderer's willing arms  
 Had still encircled Circe—were love the thrall of charms;  
 Eschew them all! For philtres are worse than merely vain:  
 They hurt the understanding, they drive a girl insane.  
 If you would charm, be charming—a thing which, be assured,  
 No face, no form, unaided, has ever yet procured;  
 Though you be fair as Nireus, whom Homer loved to sing,  
 Or Hylas, whom the Naiads hid in their woodland spring,  
 If you would keep your sweetheart, nor wake amazed to find  
 Some morning she has left you—you must improve your mind!  
 A fragile thing is beauty, and with increasing years  
 It must, perforce, diminish—until it disappears;  
 The violet and lily are soon enough out-worn,  
 The fairest rose will wither—and leave an ugly thorn;  
 And you, my handsome fellow, your hair will soon be gray,  
 And seams and hateful wrinkles—they, too, are on the way:  
 Build up your mind, for beauty some solid prop requires,  
 And that alone stands by you until your funeral fires.  
 Take pains to be accomplished; a gentleman will find  
 Both languages are needful to cultivate the mind:  
 Ulysses was not handsome, and yet 'tis evident  
 That goddesses adored him—the man was eloquent!  
 How oft when he was leaving, Calypso prophesied

A sea too rough and stormy for any boat to ride :  
 How oft she craved his story, how oft he told the tale,  
 Yet with such art he told it, it never once grew stale.  
 Once on a time she asked him—as many times before—  
 To tell the death of Rhesus. They stood upon the shore.  
 So, with a stick—he held one, it happened, in his hand—  
 He pictured out his story upon the hard, wet sand.  
 ‘ Now here was Troy ’, he told her, and traced the walls, ‘ and where  
 You see this line, the Simois. My camp was over there.  
 Here was the field ’—he drew it—‘ where Dolon and his host  
 Guarded the Thracian horses ; we slew them at their post.  
 And there, the tents of Rhesus ; and this would be the track  
 I followed with his horses that night, when I came back ’.  
 Here, while he still was drawing, a billow by mishap  
 Smote city, camp, and Rhesus—and wiped them off the map !  
 ‘ Now, look you ’, cried the goddess, ‘ how can you hope the sea  
 That whelms such names as those are, will let you go scot-free ! ’  
 So, lovers, ‘ tis with beauty ; and hence, I bid you seek  
 For things of greater value than just a fine physique.

Ovid, like Afranius, is not thinking of the family circle. The students whom he is addressing are the gilded exquisites of the Augustan Age, and the whole poem is really a masterpiece of satire upon the subject with which it professes to deal so seriously. But the humorous and observant Ovid is never so wise, never so well worth remembering, as when he has a twinkle in his eye, and the advice he gives here may be taken to heart by men of all classes and periods. It will be seen, of course, that this passage is merely a rhetorical expansion of our old theme. The poet assumes the conventionalized attitude of the professor and speaks *ex cathedra*. The ironical exaggeration of this didactic attitude is seen in the sly emphasis upon a systematic arrangement and development of topics. For the same reason his pronouncements are purposely axiomatic and familiar, his illustrations purposely traditional and commonplace. The Homeric motive, for instance, of helping out one's story with illustrations, which Ovid himself uses elsewhere, not to mention Tibullus, Plutarch, Macrobius, and doubtless others, was discussed as early as Aristotle. With us the Grave Digger in Hamlet is the classical example of the man who cannot tell a story at all without the aid of diagrams. Doubtless, too, the motive of the waves washing away whatever one writes upon the sand was familiar enough, but, so far as I can remember, this is the earliest appearance of it in the surviving record.



The passages I have quoted are quite enough to show that the value of magic in a love-affair as compared with natural advantages was a well-worn topic in the later literature of Antiquity. We see that it was announced from the stage, discussed in the boudoir, argued in the schools of philosophy, enlarged upon in the schools of rhetoric. It is probably safe to assume that, so far as literary influence is concerned, the fountain head was largely, if not entirely, Euripides. And this, too, despite the fact that earlier authors may have developed the theme.

On the other hand, so far as real life is concerned, it is certain that Andromache was not the first to make the plea that Euripides puts in her mouth. It springs naturally from her situation, a situation that must have begun to make its appearance not long after the first time a jealous woman undertook to remove a real or fancied rival from her path without resorting to personal violence. That was a long while ago, and since then the same situation has been repeated over and over again in all parts of the world. It was not at all unusual in the ordinary life of Antiquity, for in those days the profession of the *lena*, or go-between, included as a matter of course the brewing of love-philtres for her customers. It was common to administer them; still more common to believe—especially in certain nervous disorders, the causes of which were not visible to the popular mind—that they had been administered. Hence, perhaps, the legend of the death of Lucretius, and the contemporary explanation of the homicidal mania of Caligula. Such accusations are a commonplace of the elegiac poets, and in Greek testamentary law the modern plea of 'undue influence' was specified either as *ὑπὸ φαρμάκων* or as *γυναικὶ πειθόμενος*. And certainly during the long and relentless prosecution and persecution of witches in the Middle Ages more than one woman has found herself in the plight of Andromache, and—to save her soul from everlasting torment—has been burned alive.

But in our sympathy for Andromache let us not be unjust to Hermione. Hermione here is fairly representative of any mortal woman in the same position. The rôle of plaintiff in this suit is peculiarly trying. Whether she has made her charge in good faith or not, she has been cut to the quick in a most sensitive place, and she cannot reckon on the sympathy of the jury. The magnanimity of a woman capable of rising superior to such a situation would be little short of miraculous. She would deserve

to become an anecdote, and, as such, to be affected by all the peculiarities and privileges of an anecdote, as it wanders on from generation to generation.

We have just heard of such a woman. And, so far as I know, it is the first time she has spoken to the modern world. Our source is Satyros, a Peripatetic philosopher of the second century B. C., considerable fragments of whose *Life of Euripides* have recently come to light among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (Vol. 9, pp. 128-170). In this work, which is in the form of a dialogue, one of the characters, Eukleia—during a discussion, it would seem, of the old question of Euripides' attitude towards the fair sex—says that once upon a time a certain woman was accused of winning the love of Hystaspes by means of philtres. Whereupon [the wife of Hystaspes] sent for her (p. 157)—

μεταπεμφραμένη δὴ τὴν ἄνθρωπον ὅτ' εἰ[δεν] εἰσιούσης τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ κάλλος, 'χαίρε', φησὶν, 'γύναι' ψευδεῖς ἄρ' ἦ[σ]αν αἱ [δια]βολαί· σὺ γὰρ [έν] τῷ π[ρ]οσώπῳ τῷ σῷ καὶ τοῖς ὀ[φ]θαλμοῖς ἔχεις τὰ φάρμακα'.

But when she observed her stateliness, as she entered, and her beauty, she said, "Peace be upon you, woman. Truly, the charges against you were false; for you have your philtres in your own face and in your eyes".

A good anecdote. Just the sort of thing we might expect from the mother of a man like the great Darius. But not a new anecdote. Dr. Hunt's note that 'This anecdote of Hystaspes seems to be new' should be replaced, at least for the present, by 'This anecdote seems to be new—of Hystaspes'. About two centuries after Satyros told this story, we find it recorded in Plutarch's *Moralia* (141 B) that once upon a time a certain Thessalian woman was accused of winning the love of Philip of Macedon by means of philtres. Whereupon Olympias, the wife of Philip, sent for her—

ὥς δ' εἰς ὄψιν ἔλθοῦσα τό τ' εἶδος εὐπρεπὴς ἐφάνη καὶ διελέχθη πρὸς αὐτὴν οὐκ ἀγεννῶς οὐδ' ἀσυνέτως, 'χαιρέτωσαν' εἶπεν ἡ 'Ολυμπιάς· αἱ διαβολαί· σὺ γὰρ ἐν σεαυτῇ τὰ φάρμακα ἔχεις'.

But upon her appearance, seeing that not only was she fair to look upon, but that her conversation was refined and sensible, Olympias said, "Away with the charges against you; for you have your philtres in your self".

A good anecdote. Just the sort of thing we might expect from the mother of a man like Alexander the Great. To be sure,

since this beautiful and stately co-respondent parted with her somewhat uncritical Persian lover she had improved her understanding and can talk like a lady; but she is the same girl, and the story is the same story. But that Hystaspes was her first lover is as unlikely as that Philip of Macedon was her last. And when we consider the temperament of anecdotes, as such, we know that we shall never discover the identity of the original parties in this *cause célèbre*.

The truth is that all men in general, and the Peripatetics in particular, are devoted to anecdotes. And with reason, for when anecdotes are good, they possess all the advantages enumerated by Afranius—

Aetas et corpus tenerum et morigeratio.

But, unfortunately, the better anecdotes are the less they are treated with proper respect by their lovers. The trouble is that they are temperamentally prone to over-emphasize *morigeratio*. They are too obliging. Hence, like the Sultan of Babylon's daughter, in Boccaccio's famous story, they wander on and on from one to another. And, again like that errant and erring damsel, they turn up at the end as attractive as ever and as good as new. 'Bocca basciata', as Messer Giovanni himself remarks, 'non perde ventura, anzi rinnuova come fa la luna'. 'A kissed mouth is not impaired, rather renews itself as does the moon'. Good anecdotes appeal to us, not because they are true, or truthful, but because they never fail to have—

Aetas et corpus tenerum et morigeratio.

They fall in with our preconceived notions of what they ought to be.

This is eminently the case with our anecdote. It owed its continued existence and popularity not to its truth, as such—it is not at all certain that it ever was actually true of anyone—but to the fact that it is such a fine illustration of our notion, more or less well-founded, that a boy is the son of his mother rather than of his father. Hence, if we make GM = Great Mother, MF = Mere Father, and GS = Great Son, the formula for a great man should be—

$$GM + MF = GS.$$

Now, substitute for GS Darius, or Alexander, or Rameses, or Hannibal, or Caesar, or Charlemagne, or Tamerlane, or Napo-

leon, or any other man of the same type, call upon the ever obliging anecdote of Satyros and Plutarch (and doubtless others), and we have at once a fine passage for the section devoted to Conquerors in our 'Lives of Illustrious Men', and a striking commentary on Tibullus' distich in which he returns to our traditional theme (1, 8, 23)—

quid queror heu misero carmen nocuisse, quid herbas?  
forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis.

Why dream the youth's undoing is caused by charms, by brews?  
No magic arts are practised that beauty needs to use.

It would be interesting to know just why this anecdote of Satyros drifted into his Life of Euripides. One may fairly suspect that the situation in the Andromache had something to do with it. But the text preceding our passage is too fragmentary to furnish a definite connection, and for the present at least it seems wiser to leave the matter as it stands. Of course, too, there was more than one Hystaspes. Xerxes, for example, had a brother Hystaspes, whose wife Rhodogune is mentioned by two of the late lexicographers. And, as it now stands, the text of our anecdote is so badly mutilated at the beginning that the more definite designation of our Hystaspes and also the identity of the speaker of the words I have quoted have completely disappeared. In other words, the only surviving term of our formula is 'Hystaspes'. The version of Plutarch, however, makes it quite clear that the original equation in the version of Satyros must have been—

The Wife of Hystaspes + Hystaspes = Darius,  
or rather—

The Great Mother of Darius + the Mere Father of  
Darius = Darius.

For here, it would seem, as for the most part elsewhere, Hystaspes is known to posterity only as a 'Mere Father'.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

## V.—TWO TABELLAE DEFIXIONUM IN THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Charles T. Currelly, Director of the Royal Ontario Museum of Toronto, I have been privileged to read two *tabellae defixionum* in the possession of the Museum. These were purchased by Mr. Currelly himself in Athens two or three years ago. This fact and certain textual features prove them to be of Attic origin. The chemical condition of the lead is such as would result from many centuries of exposure to atmospheric or soil conditions. This and the palaeography of the tablets compel me to believe that they are not modern counterfeits. Moreover, no counterfeiter would be so naively inconsistent in his errors as is the composer of one of the tablets (II.). Of the circumstances surrounding their discovery we unfortunately know nothing.

I. Leaden tablet, rectangular, 9.0 x 6.9 mm., originally folded double and pierced with a nail; quite fragile, especially along lines of folding; inscribed on both sides with rude letters almost uniformly 7 mm. in height. The writing on the face is in two parts, one to the right, the other to the left, of the diagonal descending from left to right. In the first the letters begin at the right-hand margin and continue towards the left. In the second they begin at the bottom of the tablet without regular alignment of initials and run from left to right. That the first part was originally written first is proved by the fact that the several lines of the second part were so arranged as to fill in a left-over space. None of the groups of letters as they stand can be read as words, as in Wünsch, *Defixionum Tabellae Atticae*, I. G. III. 3, 55; 77; 88; 95 (cf. 81, 110-135). The confusion of the letters, added to their positive lack of legibility in places, makes impossible a convincing reconstruction of what was in the writer's mind. The deliberate purpose of such confusion was, in the event of the discovery of the tablet, to prevent detection of the author through a list of his enemies (cf. Wünsch, *D. T. A.*, p. 30, "ut lectorem fugiant").





## A

1-4. It is impossible to discover the names latent in this riddle.

5. See Bechtel-Fick, *Griechische Personennamen*, p. 60.

6. Usually the nom. is used in defixional lists of names (see Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae*, Paris, 1904, praef. l-li), but nom. and acc. are sometimes found together, as in Wünsch, *D. T. A.*, 22 and 29.

8. Perhaps *Φιλιστίδης* as in Wünsch, *D. T. A.*, 9, 6; 20, 4; 28, 3; *Aud.* 56.

9-10. *Δημοτίων* is read in Wünsch 42, 4, but without patronymic.

13. *Χαρακτήρες*: The resemblance of the fifth *χαρακτήρ* to the familiar Christian symbol is due to an accidental stroke of the metal writing-point. Can *χ* here be the symbol of Osiris in l. 6 of the defixio published by Audollent in the *Bull. Arch.*, 1910, pp. 137 ff.?

15. The letters are very indistinct.

If these names be correctly deciphered, then *Ἀλκίδης*, *Εὐθυκλῆς*, *Καλλικλείδης*, *Κόροιβος*, *Λυσάνωρ*, *Χαίριων* appear here for the first time in defixiones.

## B

16. Perhaps some expression that gave significance to the list of names in A.

All the letters of the Attic alphabet have been employed except *Γ*, *Ζ*, *Θ*, *Ξ*, *Φ*, *Ψ*. Judging from the forms of these, our only indication of date, we can safely state that this tablet may have been written at any time during the fourth and third centuries B. C.

II. Lead tablet, roughly circular, 9.1 cmm. in diameter, 5 mm. in thickness, thickly covered with litharge and hard crystals of lead carbonate, especially near the edges; originally folded double and written on one side only in rude, irregular letters varying in height from 6 to 2 mm.; in places the lead has been worn smooth and all traces of writing have disappeared. By far the larger part of the formula occupies all but a small arc at the left of the circle and is written in horizontal lines. The upper half of the small arc contains in horizontal lines the completion of a sentence begun in the larger body of the text, while the lower half is filled to the last millimetre with a variation of the formula previously used, but in this case written perpendicularly to the rest of the text.



8 [δ]ύνα-	καταδῶ καταδῶ	1
9 μιν	Ἄρισ[τ]οβούλο(υ)	2
10 καὶ σῶ-	..... το(υ)ς γλῶτ(τ)αν	3
11 μα Ἄ-	κα[ὶ σῶμα] πόδας χεῖρας.	4
12 ριστοβού-	καταδῶ πόδας	5
13 λο(υ) ἀν(τι)δί-	καὶ [γλῶττ]αν	6
14 κο(υ).	οἰκ[ία]ν <πόδας>	7
	καταδῶ γλῶτταν	15
	καὶ σῶμα	16
	καὶ [πόδας δύναμ]ιν συν-	17
	[δίκου]ς μετὰ Ἄρι-	18
	στο[βούλου] πάντας τοὺς.	19
	[κα]τ[αδῶ πόδας]	20
	οἰκία[ν] γλῶτταν	21
	[χεῖρας σῶμα] δύνα[μ]ιν	22
	[Ἄριστοβούλου ἀ]ντ[ι]-	23
	[δίκ]ο(υ).	24
29 τοῖ[s]		
28 ὄτταν		
27 ἡδίκον γλ-		
26 βούλον τὸν ἄ-		
25 καταδῶ Ἄρισ[τ]ο-		

1. *καταδω*: See also 5. 15. 20. 25; by far the commonest verb to denote the magic act of defixion. Only in Wünsch, D. T. A., 49a 3 is this word or a synonym repeated in the same line without an intervening word, and nowhere else in the first line; cf., however, Wünsch, D. T. A., 79, 12-13 and 119. Repetition of such expressions at intervals is common in Attic defixiones, but as a rule each mention introduces a new victim; but cf. Aud. 68, 108; Wünsch, D. T. A., 79, 1. 13-15; 90; 105, where the same person is in each instance involved. The monotony of the repetition in this tablet is duplicated only in the Johns Hopkins Tab. Def. (Fox, A. J. P., XXXIII, 1, suppl., pp. 16-31).

2. *Ἀρισ[τ]οβούλο(ν)*: Cf. 11-13. 18-19. 23 (conjectured); the first appearance of this name in defixiones. It is not found in Attic inscriptions till towards the close of the fourth century and gradually increases in frequency well into Roman times. For identification see 3.

*ο=ου*: So in 3. 13. 14. 24, but *τούς* in 19 and 29 (?). According to Meisterhans-Schwyzler (Gram. d. att. Inschr., pp. 6-7, nn. 22-23) *ο* for *ου* ranges from a very early period to the middle of the second century B. C., persisting much later in defixiones than in official documents where it virtually disappears in the latter half of the fourth century. It occurs in Aud., 1 a 33; 50, 2. 8. 12; 53 b 2; 62, 4; 63, 4; 68a 10; b 4. 5. 7-8. 10; 69 1 b 4; II b 4; 80, 41 (all but the first and the last are Attic and are assigned by the editor to the fourth century); Wünsch, D. T. A., 38, 5; 101, 4. 6; 102 a 8; b 12; 103 a 2. 3; 107 a; 138, 1 (these are assigned about evenly to the third and fourth centuries). Wilhelm, however, (*Jahreshefte d. öst. arch. Inst. in Wien*, VII, 1904, pp. 105 ff.) very convincingly locates in the fourth century nearly all those tablets that Wünsch locates in the third. His article supersedes those by Schwyzler (*Neue Jhbr.*, 1900, pp. 244 ff.) and Ziebarth (*Gött. Nachr.*, 1899, pp. 105 ff.). For final conclusions as to the date of our tablet see *infra* pp. 79-80.

3. .... *τος* or *το(ν)ς*: Probably the gen. of some patronymic like *Φιλοκράτης*, *Δημοκράτης*, or *Χάρης*. Nowhere in Attic defixiones does the patronymic follow the son's (or daughter's) name in the genitive (cf., however, Aud., 50, 5-6), and therefore we cannot say whether the article is to be employed here before the patronymic as in official inscriptions (Meisterhans-Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, § 86, 8, p. 224), or to be omitted. If the father's name is as long as either of the first alternatives suggested, the lacuna would not admit

the article; if it is as short as the second alternative, there is plenty of space for the article. Owing to the lacuna it is impossible to identify Aristobulus in any way.

γλωτ(τ)αν: But correctly spelled in 15. This misspelling is very common in defixiones, e. g., Wünsch, D. T. A., 52; 56, 4; 57, 21; 61 a 2; 74, 3; Aud., 47, 2. 7. 9; 66, 2. Meisterhans-Schwyzler (pp. 95-96, n. 844) notes it in the fourth century and observes that from the third century onward it becomes very common in all classes of inscriptions.

4. καί [σῶμα]: Supplied on analogy of 10-11. 16. The range of bodily parts defixed is strikingly Attic (see Wünsch, D. T. A., and Aud., passim).

καί: Inconsistent use of the connective is characteristic of this vulgar department.

6. γλωτταν: Cf. 3. 15. 21. 27-28.

7. οἰκ[ία]ν: See 21. This implies the destruction of the entire family, as οἶκον in the oracle in Herod. VI 86, 3. Cf. the Hebrew curse: "... It shall enter the thief's house, and the house of him that hath sworn falsely by my name, and it shall roost in the midst of his house and consume it, with its beams and its stones". (Zech. V 4, trans. by George Adam Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, p. 302).

<πόδας>: Inadvertent repetition, as ἔργα, γλωτταν (Wünsch, D. T. A., 53).

13-14. ἀν(τι)δίκo(ν): For similar accidental omission of a syllable see κα(τα)σχόντες (Aud., 74, 7); Ἀσ(τύ)ρονος (ib. 302, 1). The word is not rare in defixiones, as καταδ(η)νύ[ω] Διοκλῆ (ὥς τὸν) ἐμὸν ἀντίδικον (Wünsch, D. T. A., 94, 2-3): παραλάβε[τε το]ὺς ἀντίδικους (Aud. 18, 7); see also Stryd, Ἐφ. Ἀρχ., 1903, pp. 55 ff., IV; Oliverio, Studi Ital. di Fil. Class., XVIII (1900), pp. 445 ff.; Aud., 302\*; and certain Latin equivalents in Aud., 93; 95; 96; 98; 101; 111-112; 133; 221; 226.

17. [πόδας]: Or perhaps χεῖρας (cf. 4).

17-19. συν[δίκους] . . . . . τοὺς: Perhaps συνδίκος (after Ἀριστοβούλο), as καὶ τὸς συνδίκος αὐτοῦ (Wünsch, Münchner Tab. Def., V, 5, in Arch. f. Rel., XIV, 1911, pp. 150-151). σύνδικοι are often mentioned in legal defixiones; e. g., καὶ τοὺς τούτων συνδίκo(ν)ς πάντας (id. D. T. A., 39, 20-22): καὶ σύνδικοι καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος [φίλος] α[ὐ]τοῖς (103 a 8-9). Or expressions of like content are used, as συνπαρόντας (79, 11); συνηγόρους (95 b 23-24); καὶ τοῖς . . . . . βοη(θ)οῖς πάντας (94, 5-6); συνπράττοντα (37, 10); aduocatus (Wünsch,



Die Lamminae litteratae des Trierer Amphitheaters, 12, in Bonn. Jhbr., 1910, Heft 119, pp. 1 ff.). Cf. note on ἀντιδίκου(ν) supra.

19. πάντας τοὺς: A corrective afterthought to be read before συν[δίκου]ς.

20-22. [πόδας . . . . χείρας σώμα]: These conjectures made on the basis of completer portions of the text satisfactorily fit the lacunae.

29. τοῦ[ς]: Here the text ceases abruptly; probably τοὺς συνδίκους was in the writer's mind.

In this tablet appear all the letters of the post-Euclidean alphabet except Z, H, Θ, Φ and Ψ. c occurs fourteen times, while ζ occurs but once (17). The form of Pi is that in which the cross-bar projects beyond the uprights. The joint appearance of c and Π on marble would ordinarily lead one to assign the document containing them to the second century (see Roberts and Gardner, *Introd. to Gr. Epigr.*, II, p. xvi; Wünsch, *D. T. A.*, praef. i). But this dating, while possible here, is scarcely probable in view of the occurrence of o for ου (see n. 2). The same difficulty is found in Wünsch, *D. T. A.*, 102 (where Γ is counted four times, but Π and Π three times each), and so sensitive to it is the editor that he calls the tablet "titulus ἀρχαῖζων", and with that dismisses the matter of date. But Wilhelm (*op. cit.*, pp. 112-113,) demonstrates that there is no real conflict between the palaeography on the one hand and the orthography on the other and locates the document in the fourth century. This argument I accept and in so doing locate our tablet in the latter part of the same period. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Π is the regular form in a papyrus written in the period 310-290 B. C. (see Schubart, *Pap. Graec. Berol.*, 1911, pl. 3 and p. viii). Finally, one must constantly bear in mind in dating defixiones that owing to their nature their composition is likely to be marked by an incongruous mixture of archaisms and innovations.

W. SHERWOOD FOX.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

VI.—JULIUS OR "JULIUS": A NOTE ON VERG.  
AEN. I. 286 SEQ.

Nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,	286
Imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,	
Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.	
Hunc tu olim caelo, spoliis Orientis onustum,	
Accipies securâ; vocabitur hic quoque votis.	
Aspera tum positâ mitescent saecula bellis;	291
Cana Fides, et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus,	
Iura dabunt; dirae ferro et compagibus artis	
Claudentur Belli portae; etc.	

Commentators in the early editions of the *Aeneid* assumed, for the plain reason that this passage names Julius, that it refers to the Julius Caesar whom we regularly know by that name, as the ancients did. Ever since the edition of Heyne, however, editors have generally explained the reference as wholly to Augustus, and this is the view of school-room orthodoxy at the present time. Nevertheless it seems on some accounts — in a political year — as if the recall might suitably be applied to this bit of commentary. In spite of the temerity of venturing to question a long-accepted and authoritative interpretation of so familiar a text, and in spite of the professional charm of the less obvious of possible explanations, it still seems as if the grounds of the received interpretation might usefully be subjected to doubt, as possibly they have not been by all the editors who have repeated the now traditional comment that the passage refers throughout — with an altogether exceptional use of the name Iulius<sup>1</sup> — to C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus.

There is of course no doubt that the lines 291 seq. belong to Augustus. As to the earlier ones, Heyne gives three reasons for concluding that Augustus is meant throughout the passage, rather than Divus Iulius:

"Nec terrarum imperium (v. 287) facile Caesari tribuitur, neque is spoliis Orientis onustus, neque ab eo pax restituta (v. 294). Contra Augusto illa ubique obvia".

<sup>1</sup> Mommsen (*Staatsr.* II<sup>3</sup>, p. 768) notes the fact that even from about the beginning of the fourth decade B. C. — during the Triumvirate — Octavianus discontinued the use of the names *C. Iulius* in favor of *Imp. Caesar*.

Of these, it is not easy to see why the universal imperium could not be ascribed to Julius Caesar, if not in the strictly legal sense, at least in a practical and complimentary sense, as a summing up of the world-wide conquests which were wonderingly enumerated not only by the great Julius's own contemporaries, but also by a writer like Ovid when the career of Augustus himself was far advanced; indeed, considering the completeness with which Augustus originally owed his place and power to his great adoptive father, to the fact that it was Julius who had created the public occasion for connecting the Julian gens with the name of Iulus at all, it would have been very strange if Julius had not been mentioned in this connection in just about this way. As James Henry in his *Aeneidea*<sup>1</sup> aptly remarked: "In a poem written for the glorification of Augustus . . . all mention of Augustus's uncle and immediate predecessor, the deified founder of the Julian race and dynasty, could no more have been omitted than could in these days be omitted in a poem in honor of the third Napoleon all mention of the third Napoleon's uncle and predecessor." In particular, the third of the three great victories by which Julius Caesar assured his final supremacy over his rivals in the empire was won at Munda in Spain; so there is an especial neatness in the *Imperium Oceano . . . terminet*, as applied to him.

The third of Heyne's three objections to the natural application of these verses, that the restoration of peace was by Augustus, not Julius, is no difficulty at all, but the contrary, as we shall see.

The second is more serious. *Spoliis Orientis onustum* fits the case of Julius somewhat less aptly than that of Augustus Caesar, certainly if one explains it, with Servius, as a reference to the brief campaign against Pharnaces, though even in that the famous epigrammatic brevity of the announcement of victory would give some point to the allusion. But there is perhaps another significance in the phrase. It does not refer to Caesar's return to Rome but to his reception in heaven. At about the time when Virgil was writing, presumably, this passage, Augustus was building the temple of the Divine Julius, and using for that purpose, it would appear, precisely some of the spoils which he had brought from the East upon his return in the year 29. He dedicated the temple in August of that year. We are specifically told of the beaks of the Egyptian war vessels which were mounted on the base of the temple,<sup>2</sup> and that Augustus consecrated *Dona*

<sup>1</sup> London, 1873, Vol. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Dio Cas. L.I. 19; etc.

*ex manibiis in Capitolio et in aede divi Iuli et in aede Apollinis et in aede Vestae et in templo Martis Ultoris . . . quae mihi constiterunt HS circiter milliensi*<sup>1</sup>; and Strabo<sup>2</sup> and Pliny<sup>3</sup> mention in particular as having been dedicated by Augustus in the temple of Divus Iulius the Venus Anadyomene of Apelles (from Cos), τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἀναθέντος τῷ πατρὶ τὴν ἀρχηγέτιν τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ.

The various honors which were done by Augustus to the memory of Julius were of course prominent in people's minds; not only the temple of Divus Iulius but also that of Mars Ultor and the Basilica Iulia and the Curia Iulia, to say nothing of the elaborate obsequies and the popular interpretation of the famous comet<sup>4</sup> (Cf. *famam qui terminet astris*) had served to keep prominently in mind the thought of the Divine Julius, in whose divinity Augustus took so obvious an interest that it was the most natural thing in the world for the courtly poet to refer to this glorified restorer of the line of Iulus.

Certainly not without some interest in this connection, as illustrating at least the popular inclination to connect the name of Iulus with that of the great Dictator, is the story, however apocryphal it may be, related by Suetonius,<sup>5</sup> of the discovery at Capua of a bronze tablet on the tomb in which Capys the founder of Capua was said to have been buried. This discovery, he says, was a few months before Caesar's assassination, *cum in colonia Capua deducti lege Iulia coloni ad exstruendas villas vetustissima sepulchra disicerent, idque eo studiosius facerent, quod aliquantum vasculorum operis antiqui scrutantes reperiabant*. The *tabula aenea*, he says, was *conscripta litteris verbisque Graecis hac sententia*, "*Quandoque ossa Capiis detecta essent, fore ut Iulo prognatus manu consanguineorum necaretur magnisque mox Italiae cladibus vindicaretur*." Suetonius cites Cornelius Balbus as authority for his account.

There is even a possible relevancy in the fact, considering that Virgil mentions Julius next after Romulus in this prophecy of the Julian line, that the right of asylum which the senate granted to the sanctuary of the Divine Julius is especially remarked by Dio to have been unexampled in the case of any god since the time of Romulus: ἀπηγόρευσαν δὲ μηδένα εἰς τὸ ἡρώων αὐτοῦ καταφυγόντα ἐπ'

<sup>1</sup> *Res Gestae*, IV. 23 seq.; cf. Dio, LI. 22. <sup>2</sup> XIV. 2. 19. <sup>3</sup> *N. H.* XXXV. 91.

<sup>4</sup> Verg. *Ecl.* IX. 47; Suet. *Div. Iul.* 88; Dio. *Cas.* XLV. 7; etc.

<sup>5</sup> *Div. Iul.* 81.

ἀδεία μήτε ἀνδρηλατεῖσθαι, μήτε συλᾶσθαι ὅπερ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲ τῶν θεῶν, πλὴν τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ῥωμύλου γενομένων, ἐδεδώκεσαν.<sup>1</sup>

But all of Virgil's passage, however, was of course intended to gratify the existing head of the Julian house. Early in this same year 29 B. C. Augustus had closed the doors of the temple of Janus, an enormously popular act which Heyne (as his third objection: *neque ab eo pax restituta*) with a rather inept superfluousness says did not belong to Julius. For Heyne and the other commentators following his lead seem to overlook the evident meaning of *tum* in this place. It is not 'then, at the same time', but 'then, next afterward'. Julius, the Caesar whose name especially recalls that of the great Iulus and in whose deification as the founder or restorer of the Julian line Octavianus is so intimately concerned, shall be received in heaven glorified with the spoils of the East: he also shall be called upon in prayer. And then, afterward, he having gone to heaven and his apotheosis being a matter of official recognition and popular enthusiasm, and Augustus being now in power, the warlike age shall grow peaceful and the grim gates of war shall be closed. The meaning seems too obvious to justify a question.

The passage in the sixth book of the Aeneid beginning (vs. 791) *Hic vir, hic est*, offers no real inconsistency with this view. Ovid's famous account of the deification of Julius Caesar<sup>2</sup> is written in the very tone and manner that would be natural to Ovid writing a few years later in Augustus's principate with Virgil's present lines in mind with their natural interpretation. As in the Virgilian lines, Julius Caesar is made by Ovid the initial theme of his laudation, and presently (vs. 750 seq.) Ovid continues to the effect that none of Caesar's achievements is greater than his having been the father of Augustus<sup>3</sup>; and like Virgil he concludes the passage with a glorification of the latter. It would appear that commentators on the present passage of the Aeneid have been misled by an overemphasis upon one theory of the meaning of the words *spoliis Orientis onustum*, which even if it be correct is not necessarily conclusive, in spite of the admitted fact that the Augustan age was fond of expatiating upon Augustus's eastern conquests, and have neglected the natural conclusion that the two parts of the passage do not refer to the same person.

ALLAN P. BALL.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

<sup>1</sup> Dio. XLVII. 19. Met. XV. 745-870. <sup>2</sup> Note especially vss. 760, 761.



## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

- E. G. SIHLER. *Annals of Caesar; A Critical Biography with a Survey of the Sources.* New York, Stechert and Co., 1911.  
C. Julius Caesar; sein Leben nach den Quellen kritisch dargestellt. Deutsche, vom Verfasser selbst besorgte, berichtigte und verbesserte Ausgabe. Leipzig and Berlin, Teubner, 1912.

The author of this work enjoys the distinction of having been the first to receive a doctorate in classical philology from Johns Hopkins University (1878). In a long career as an educator and writer, beginning with that date, he has lent an able hand to the work, in which a few Americans have coöperated, of placing the classical scholarship of the country on a sound basis and of making it respected by the rest of the world. Although competent to edit texts and compile vocabularies, Professor Sihler has preferably devoted his time to research in the history and civilization of Greece and Rome. The trend of his interest is indicated by a partial list of studies given in his Preface, p. viii. These publications, with others not there named, have won for him a reputation by no means limited to America. It is right, therefore, that the present volume, a product of his mature thought, be given respectful consideration; and it is no small compliment to American scholarship, as well as to the author personally, that B. G. Teubner has printed a German edition of the work. In this revision, prepared by the author himself, will be found a few corrections of errors and one or two other changes of slight importance.

In the sifting and presentation of his material Sihler has aimed to determine what actually happened, and where that is impossible, to give the reader a careful estimate of the probability in the case. Undoubtedly this is a sound principle of historiography. He desires, further, to leave the interpretation of the facts to the reader, repressing his own emotions, if he has any, and holding his personality in the background. But the result of such an endeavor, if successful, would be, not history in the best sense of the word, but rather a collection of data which might be used in historical composition. Without sympathy it is impossible to understand human character, whether present or past. The ideal historian, therefore, not holding himself aloof, much less taking a partisan attitude, enters into psychological relations with all his characters, so far as his material permits, and after the pattern of

the dramatist, presents in the tragedy of history a conflict of personalities and principles. It is fortunate that Sihler has not followed his own rule, for his interpretative suggestions constitute perhaps the most valuable feature of the book.

The crying evil in the historiography of the later Roman Republic has been the violent swinging of the pendulum of judgment between Caesar and Cicero. Generally the biographer or historian has not considered it a part of his function to do justice to both of these eminent men. A doubt may be ventured as to whether any modern authority on the period has been able to take so impartial an attitude as the author of this book. He is neither for nor against Caesar; but step by step he interprets the material with a fair mind, and in uncertain matters judiciously gives the accused the benefit of the doubt. Early in the narrative he pays a pleasant tribute to Caesar's character (p. 58; German edition, p. 49): "A certain trait of Caesar stands out in the tradition of antiquity: he was charming and rarely winsome in his own circle. His friends worshipped him when he had become eminent, not, however, for his achieved eminence; for this never wins the hearts of men. No, in him there was a blending of traits and qualities which held the loyalty and deeper affection of his inner circle (Hirtius, Balbus, Matus, Oppius, Pollio) in a rare and unique manner".

In general his opinion of Caesar is more favorable than otherwise, not because he has predetermined it so, but because the facts seem to point in that direction. In treating of the alleged conspiracy of 65 B. C. and of Caesar's part in it, Sihler cautiously limits himself to stating that the young politician was in a receptive frame of mind. From the few known facts we may only infer that it was an unusually bold political intrigue, afterward fearfully colored by the red light reflected upon it by the Catilinarian conspiracy. Of complicity in the latter plot Sihler substantially acquits Caesar by setting down to revenge the insinuations against him offered by Catulus and Piso. The probability seems to be that Caesar and Crassus used Catiline as long as the latter limited himself to political agitation, but broke with the incendiary and assassin. The reader could wish that a few lines had here been given to explaining the constitutional question involved in the senatorial debate over the accomplices of Catiline. The interest of the work, however, centres mainly in individuals and in party politics. So, too, the agrarian law of Caesar's consulship is treated solely as a political and personal measure with no reference to its economic or social bearings. In this connection the author has made a slight misuse of the word *plebiscitum*, the distinctive feature of which is *tribunis ferentibus* (Gell. xv. 27. 4). The measures which Caesar as consul carried through the tribal assembly, accordingly, were not *plebiscita* but *leges*. This, however, is a technical detail.

A great part of the volume is devoted to the Gallic and Civil

wars—a mixed web of military and political threads. Any considerable contribution to existing knowledge of Caesar's generalship must be based on a careful examination of the battle-fields; but this work, too, lies outside the author's plan. It is relatively difficult for an American to study personally the topography of campaigns which extended over various provinces of the Roman empire. Here the practical thing would be for the author to lay aside his commendable attachment to the literary material, and make more use of good modern authorities,—not only Holmes, whom Sihler cites with approval, but also Stoffel (*"Histoire de Jules César"*) and various other works. The critical exposition of Caesar's campaigns, leading to such an estimate of his generalship as may possess some degree of finality, is the task of the military expert. Recognizing not only this fact but also the general trend of interest toward the non-military aspects of history, the modern biographer of Caesar might be expected to abbreviate his account of the wars in order to make space for other matter. Doubtless many a reader would be grateful for information concerning the civilization of Gaul before the coming of Caesar, and concerning the effect of the conquest on the subjugated people and on the Roman empire. Similarly it might be assumed that the chief interest in Caesar's consulship and dictatorship would lie in the constructive work of the statesman. Here the leading inquiry would be, what were the needs of the empire, and how did Caesar try to meet them. Such a study of the man and his times would have its advantages and attractions.

It is not the function of the reviewer, however, to censure an author for what he has not attempted—particularly for not having written two volumes instead of one. His duty is rather to aim at an appreciation of actual achievement. Evidently the choice of material was determined largely by the desire to be helpful to readers of Caesar's writings; and to that purpose the subject matter of the book is most appropriate. The same object explains the annalistic grouping of events. This form of historiography, preferred by the ancients, has been abandoned by most modern writers because it does not adapt itself to the treatment of what is now considered the substance of history—to the presentation of the great movements in the life of a people. To the reader of Caesar's Commentaries, however, who is taking his first lessons in the interpretation of historical sources, the arrangement is admirably suited. The learner is here given the pertinent material in chronological order, and is expected, with the help of the author's suggestions, to exercise his mind in historical synthesis.

Among the salient features of the work must be reckoned the scattered comments on the ancient authorities and the more extended estimates at the close. Here, again, the author holds himself severely to his definite purpose, giving in condensed form

the information necessary for finding one's way through the literary material charged with conflicting views and improbabilities. He maintains that Sallust, in spite of private failings, was a true historian, sane in judgment and impartial in his treatment of character. Most of the opinion adverse to Caesar in the later historians is due, he supposes, to Livy, who in his lifelong narration of the vicissitudes of Rome reached the Civil War at about the age of sixty—too late in life to appreciate anti-republican conditions. For Suetonius Sihler expresses great sympathy. "He is no philosopher, no statesman nor judge of statesmen, not even a political writer, but, be it spoken with all due humility, he is at least a scholar". Acquainted with the writings of Caesar's admirers, he was swayed by those of the opposite faction, some of whom "were not content to gather evil reports and evil facts, but seem to have done their utmost to give an unfavorable interpretation to all acts that were open to more than one interpretation". Suetonius was evidently conscientious but lacked critical sense. On p. 61 attention is called to his discrimination in the choice of authorities for a certain event; yet this critical attitude is more apparent than real, for the authorities cited were evidently far less trustworthy than Livy and Sallust. On Tanusius, one of these authors, see Seneca, Ep. 93. 11. Within the field of rumor and gossip modern scholars are accustomed to accept and reject according to their several predilections. In discriminating between truth and fiction Dr. Sihler has shown admirable judgment. While much must be left to instinct and experience, a rule of criticism may be found useful for the first rough analysis: in the case of an author like Suetonius the student of history may begin his examination by rejecting, at least provisionally, everything that could not have been known to the public at the time of its alleged happening or that is not vouched for by trustworthy documents. This process of sifting will leave a substratum of facts on which the investigator may proceed according to his judgment to build his historical edifice. This suggestion is offered by the reviewer. Incidentally Sihler touches upon the futility of the German effort to restore lost sources. Long ago Holm vainly advised his countrymen to cease this fruitless toil and to devote themselves instead to a more thorough study of existing sources. Should they now feel constrained to give better heed to Sihler's wise words (German edition, p. 266: "Es liegt auf der Hand, dass man bei solchen Forschungen nicht viel über den Bereich des Möglichen, zuweilen in das Gebiet des Wahrscheinlichen oder des Plausibeln gelangt"), it would greatly narrow the choice of subjects for doctorate dissertations. Perhaps for that reason they will continue forever to hoe their barren field.

For Dio Cassius Sihler cherishes uncommon respect. Dio's long experience in the command of armies and in civil administration certainly contributed to his fitness for the historian's rôle.

But our author finds in his psychology the chief merit of his work. "When Dio deals with motives and designs, his favorite themes, we may rest assured that we are studying not a mere chronicler, but a political thinker, above all a keen psychologist and one who is not at all given to the idealization of human character . . . . As we become more acquainted with his character and personality, we feel that we have to do with a psychological critic of rather keen vision". This quality of Dio, so highly commended by Sihler, was as severely condemned by George Long ("Decline of the Roman Republic", iii. 131 f.). The latter contends that while making a display of his acuteness by pretending to penetrate men's souls and discover their motives, Dio really reveals his own superficiality in assuming that a man in the position of Cicero or Caesar could consistently follow a prearranged system of conduct. Long complains further of Dio's uniformly pessimistic interpretation of motives. It is possible that in the study of this author Dr. Sihler has made an advance beyond Long, and in that case the public will be glad to learn from him the facts on which his new opinion is based.

It remains to glance at the author's estimate of Mommsen, omitted from the German edition. The influence of contemporary German politics and of Hegelianism on Mommsen is vividly set forth in an appendix, and should be taken into account by readers of his "History of Rome". Many, however, will doubtless think Sihler's strictures excessively severe and even bitter. In fact it would be a mistake to regard his criticism as a final estimate of the entire work in question, much of which lies beyond the reach of baneful political prejudice. Although the earlier chapters have been outgrown by the progress of archaeology and kindred studies, and the treatment of the decline by the development of a fairer historical spirit,—of which Sihler is an exponent,—Mommsen's history as a whole stands incomparably superior to every other work of equal detail covering the same broad field. It is unfortunate, too, that among the scholars who are at present engaged in the study of the Republic and its antecedents, no one seems to combine the qualities of the historian in a sufficiently high degree to write a work that shall supersede Mommsen. The estimate, however, is amply justified as a protest, not only against certain pernicious tendencies of the work under consideration, but also against bowing down to intellectual idols, whether Caesar or Mommsen. "It is not wise, if one desires true vision, to approach a figure, no matter how great, on all fours". This utterance illustrates Sihler's powerful way of putting things. Mommsen and other eminent scholars have made themselves great by intellectual independence; and we can do them honor, not so well by grovelling in the dust before them, as by imitating their example.

A few slips of the pen and errors of typography might be pointed out, or suggestions made for the enlargement of the work



in various directions; but after all has been said, the book remains, within its self-imposed limitations, a remarkable production, strong, stimulating, and fair. Within the field of classical biography there is, at least in English, no work that gives equal insight into the material and methods of the writer. From this point of view it has a unique educational value.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

---

The Greek Bucolic Poets, with an English Translation by J. M. EDMONDS, Sometime Scholar of Jesus College, Cambridge. London: William Heinemann; New York: The Macmillan Co. MCMXII. xxviii + 527 pp. Price, \$1.50.

This new edition of the Greek Bucolic Poets is interesting both because of its English translation—by which it has won a place in the Loeb Classical Library—and because of its treatment of the Greek text.

The text is very carefully edited, and Mr. Edmonds has not only adopted many of the emendations and conjectures of other scholars, but added a goodly number of his own. In Theocr. V 24 he prefers *ἐπισθε* to *ἐπειθε*, and explains *ἀμύν* as "accus. of stake". Such a construction with *ἐπι* must be very rare—and his footnotes offer no parallel. And even if the construction is admitted here, it is surely unnecessary to write *τάδ' ἐπίσσεται* in the following line.

The translation is partly in prose and partly in verse. The songs of Theocritus' shepherds have all been rendered in verse, for the rather subtle reason that a "convention nowadays makes prose the suitable literary vehicle of dialogue or narrative, but there is no firmly-established convention of using prose to represent song". And they are rendered in rhyme, on the ground that "a literary folk-song, if one may use the term, would be impossible in blank verse". But Tennyson could write songs in blank verse in his English Idyls; and the term 'literary folk-song' would apply quite as well to the songs in Audley Court and The Golden Year as to the songs of Theocritus' *Thalysia*.

The metre employed is usually "the common ballad metre written long"—surely a most unsuitable metre in which to render the songs of the First and Fifteenth Idyls. For it needs some new definition of the term to call the Song of Thyrsis a 'ballad' (p. 6).

The translation affects a more or less archaic style, and sometimes indulges in rare or dialectic words—even in places where there is nothing especially archaic or dialectic about the original



Greek. The reader must be prepared for such expressions as 'Etna's pike', 'stirk', 'mullet' (= a kind of plant), 'even-peise', 'skilly', 'knaggy', 'meinie', 'lith', 'transmewed'. 'Cosset' may serve for ἀρνα σακίταν—especially when the translator explains the meaning of the English word—but there is no excuse for 'cosset bear's cubs' (σκύμνος ἀρκτων)—except the exigencies of metre. In Theocr. V 23 one speaker says, "There; my wage is laid", and another replies, "Thou fox! prithee how shall such laying fadge?" In XIV 34 'Aeschinas' says, "Then—you know me, Thyonichus,—I up and fetched her a clout o' the ear, and again a clout. Whereat she caught up her skirts, and was gone in a twink". And in II 100 poor 'Simaetha' is made to say, "And when so be thou be'st sure he's alone, give him a gentle nod o' the head and say", etc. "But and even as", p. 215, l. 13, may be dialect of some sort—or it may be a misprint. In Mosch. II 44, χρυσόιο is left untranslated; at Bion, I 32, 'vales' is an unnecessarily free rendering of δρύες; at Theocr. I 134 'figs' is a bit of carelessness for 'pears'.

Mr. Edmonds is duly impressed by the latest rearrangement of the poems, but fortunately he has had the courage to retain 'the long established post-Renaissance order'. On p. xxii he repeats the traditional statement that Suidas called Moschus a pupil of Aristarchus—why do so many people translate this particular γνώριμος as 'pupil'? Of Theocritus he says, "It is at any rate certain that he did not die young; for Statius calls him *Siculus senex* (Silv. 5, 3, 151)". But, even granted that 'senex' is here applied precisely to an old man, and not merely to a man who lived in days of old, it is by no means clear that Statius is referring to Theocritus at all. The best modern editors of the *Silvae* think that he means Epicharmus, and at least one good scholar has maintained that he means Theognis.

Misprints seem to be fairly numerous—though there is nothing here to compare with Mr. Sargeant's delightful 'bibliography' in the same Library's Terence. In some cases the accent of a Greek word has been omitted or lost: Ης, Theocr. VII 1; 'Εν ποκ', XVIII 1; ται, XVIII 4; γεραιτερος, XXV 48; αυτοφλοιον, XXV 208; δε, XXVII 42; ανιστατο, XXVII 68; παλιγκοτον, Megara, 92. Πόχ', Theocr. XI 62, and πόκ', XXI 29, have unnecessary accents, and σήραγγά, XXV 223, has one more than it needs. Κοῦδε stands for κοῦδέ, Theocr. II 83; έόντα for έόντα, XVII 58; ἄφαρ' for ἄφαρ, XXV 146; βόσκε for βόσκει, XXV 185. The two parts of τῶνδε, XXVI 28, should be brought together, and so should the two parts of 'stanza', p. 25, l. 1. The final vowel of Τυνδαρίδα, Theocr. XVIII 5, should not be marked as short. P. 257, l. 4, has 'throng' for 'thong', p. 143, l. 17, 'bear's' for 'bears', p. 461, l. 12, 'rivers' for 'river'.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

## Q. Orazio Flacco studiato in Italia dal Secolo XIII al XVIII.

GAETANO CURCIO, Professore di Letteratura Latina nell' Università di Catania. Catania, F. Battiato, 1913. viii + 238 pp. 5 L.

This is a very interesting book on the study of Horace in Italy, from the thirteenth century to the close of the eighteenth. It discusses the treatment and interpretation of Horace by editors and professional scholars—from the earliest printed edition down to the Bodoniana, from the commentaries of Landino and Mancinelli down to those of Petrini and Paolino. And it sets forth the influence of the Odes, Satires and Epistles on Italian literature—on Petrarch and Filelfo and Poliziano, on Pietro Bembo and Navagero and Antonio Flaminio, on Chiabrera and Testi, on Parini and Fantoni and Gozzi. It is an excellent piece of work, and every reader will wish the author to go on with the subject, and carry it through the nineteenth century.

On p. 44, among the early evidences of familiarity with Horace, mention might have been made of a very curious letter written by Eneas Silvius Piccolomini (afterwards Pope Pius II), November 13, 1444. It was written "ex oppido prugk" (Bruck-in-Steiermark), and addressed to 'Joannes Lauterbacensis'. The greater part of it is merely a paraphrase of the Second Epode, and it is certainly curious, whether or not the recipient was expected to recognize its source. I suppose it is now accessible in Rudolf Wolkman's new book, *Der Briefwechsel des Eneas Silvius Piccolomini*, Vienna, 1909, but here is the part in question quoted, with a few corrections and changes of punctuation, from the Louvain edition of 1483, fol. c. 2:

Nunc illud te uolo scire, beatum mihi uideri qui uitam ab negotiis procul publicis sibi delegit, sicut prisca gens mortalium consueuit. Quis enim non felicem illum dicat, qui nullo fauore aut ere alieno obligatus paterna rura suis bobus exercet? Audi quam beatus sit. Nempe non truci excitatur classico, quo bellum petere ac pugnam iubeatur inire. Non horret iratum mare, forum uitat & litigantium iurgia, non uisitat superba diuitum atria, non fastigiosis curialibus est supplex; sed aut altas populos adultis uitium propaginibus maritat aut in secreta reductaque ualle errantes boues & armenta pascentia prospectat. Interdum ramos inutiles falce resecat ac feliciores inserit. Interdum mella que pressit puris recondit amphoris aut oues tondet lanasque recipit. At cum Autumnus decorum caput mitibus pomis per agros extulit, magno afficitur gaudio pira ex arboribus decerpens quas sua manu inseruit. Interdum purpureas uuas colligit et aut suspendit in usum hiemis aut mustum exprimit. Libet illi iacere modo sub antiqua ilice, modo in tenaci gramine. Labuntur aque ex altis rupibus, queruntur aues in siluis, obstrepscunt fontes manantibus limphis somnosque leues inuitant. Vt uero hybernus aduenit annus et ymbres niuesque dominantur, aut apros multa cane in obstantes detrudit plagas aut rara retia leui hamite seu furca contra edaces turdos suspendit aut pavidum leporem & aduenam gruem laqueo captat. Quod si publica (!) mulier illi fuerit—quales olim fuerunt Sabine siue de quibus sacra scriptura meminit, Sara, Rebecca, uel Rachael—que solibus perusta

domum seruet & dulces nutriet liberos, multo beatior fiet, cum illa in aduentum lassi uiri uetustis lignis sacrum extruet focum claudensque textis cratibus letum pecus distenta siccabit ubera & dulcia uina dolio promens dapes inemptas apparabit. Quis hanc non laudet & desideret uitam? Non me amplius Lucrina conchilia aut rombi uel scari nec ex quouis mari uel flumine quesiti pisces iuuerunt quam leta de pinguissimis ramis arborum oliua decerpta aut agna quam solis Pascalibus festis rustici mactant uel edus preceptus ab ore lupi. Nam quantum iuuat inter rusticales epulas, mitia poma & castaneas molles ac paruas & caseum, pastas oues uidere cum domum properant, intuerique fessos boues inuersum uomerem collo trahentes languido. Multa sunt ruris gaudia que nunc singula persequi non est epistolarum angustie. Ideo uale & hec ex multis pauca notans amorem ruris aliquando indue. Iterum uale mei ut soles memor. Ex oppido prugk die. xiii. Novembris Anno. M. CCCC. xliiii.

Baptista Mantuanus, too, could quote from both the Odes and the *Ars Poetica* in his *De Vita Beata* (printed in 1474).

On p. 44, l. 5, a line which Antonio Pessina (c. 1430) quoted 'from Horace' is somehow ascribed to Virgil, *Geor.* ii. 475; it really comes from *Ecl.* ii. 62. The line about Horace discussed p. 127 n. does come from Marullus; it occurs in an epigram *De Poetis Latinis* in the first book (in both the Rome edition, c. 1490, and the Florence edition, 1497). The *Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italarum*, Florence, 1719-1724, ran in ten volumes, not nine (p. 93). Perotti's *Cornucopie* was printed earlier than 1513 (p. 73); Mr. Henry Walters, of Baltimore, has two copies of it, both printed at Venice (by different printers) in 1490. And one of them is entitled: '*Cornu Copiae Emendatissimum: in quo Opere Multa Accuratissime Addita multa que emendata sunt*'.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

A Parsing Synopsis of the 788 forms of the verb in St. Luke's Gospel from Leicarragas New Testament of the year 1571.  
By E. S. DODGSON. (London: Henry Frowde. 1912.)

The writer of this work, Mr. E. S. Dodgson, assuming, as he does throughout, the Monogenistic Theory of the origin of mankind, and believing that no language can have grown to maturity without having been influenced by other tongues, has applied these conclusions to his researches into the origin and development of Baskish. He is disposed to believe in the possibility that such remote languages as Japanese, Ainu, and Nahuatl in the modern world, and in the old world Etruscan, with its curiously Iberian-looking characters, may contain elements similar to Baskish. May not such resemblances, as exist, be not mere coincidences, but testimonies to a primeval union of the races? Words have no existence apart from the will and caprice of their

utterers, and regularity in their transmission would seem to be rather the exception than the rule, and, since they are transmitted orally, the importance of sound and intonation is greater than that of spelling.

Moreover the antiquity of man is greater than that of their languages, and we can only guess what the primitive universal tongue may have been like; but fragments of it may be found scattered through our modern tongues like veins of hidden gold.

The authors object in writing this synopsis is to enable the reader, who knows French and English, and has before him a copy of the Baskish New Testament of 1571, the German reprint of 1900, or Mr. Dodgsons edition of 1908, published by the Trinitarian Bible Society, of London, to read, as easily as a Bask of the time of Leizarraga might have done, the text of that beautiful translation.

The verbal forms, the backbone of the language, are arranged in alphabetical order. Each one is parsed in French, and translated into English, and each one is exemplified by quotations in full, showing how it influences the phrases where it occurs, and accompanied by the equivalent rendering in Calvins French translation of 1566, which Leizarraga and his four colleagues evidently collated very rigorously with the original Greek text.

The book, therefore, is a summary and an index, tabulating all that is necessary for a beginner to know as he approaches the study of this phenomenally interesting and remarkable translation. Though not a 'pons asinorum', the 'parsing synopsis' is so arranged as to help the reader to the most difficult summits of the language with the minimum of toil. To have the way made so easy is enough to tempt anyone to learn Baskish. Those moreover who have spoken Baskish all their lives might well read this book and find it most useful for reference; and, if regretting the modern decadence of their language, they turn their eyes to that happier period when Leizarraga was endeavoring, not without success, to revivify it; they will welcome the discoveries of a copy of Leizarragas work in the Ryland Library, and of Dr. G. Jerment (1804) as being the first British author to mention it, and of the fact that there was more than one edition of some parts of it in 1571. Some of Mr. Dodgsons notes are very interesting reading, but, in view of their setting, an index to them is hardly necessary. To give an example of them, it may be mentioned that on page 34 he overthrows the superstition that Hilargia (= the moon) means "the dead light". That would certainly be "Argi-hila"; and besides there is no proof that before the Basks accepted Christianity they believed the moon to be the "light of the dead". It is much safer, in Mr. Dodgsons opinion, to assume that, like many American tribes, they thought that the moon died monthly. The Maya word *paxaan*, meaning *broken, destroyed, finished*, is used in the astrological manuscripts with a very similar signification.

The "dead one" therefore would mean "the finished" (*el finado*), i. e., the completed month. Certainly 'hila' = the "dead one", also means "the month", and 'hila bethea' (lit: 'the full month') is constantly used in modern Baskish for "the month". The Basks then consider the moon as 'the month-light', though in the southern dialects it has an other name meaning 'the night-light'.

On page 4 there is a note on the word 'arrotz', which Mr. Dodgson considers to be connected with Greek *ἄλλος*, as used for example in *Odyssey* XXIII, 274, and translated by Liddell and Scott as "foreigner, stranger". Thinking also of such words as *ἁλλότριος*, *ἁλλογενής*, *ἁλλοδαπός*, *ἁλλοεθνής*, *ἁλλόφυλος*, Mr. Dodgson suggested that Baskish *arrotz*, used as the equivalent of 'foreign' in *Luke* XXIV, 18, might be regarded as derived from Greek, not necessarily in the Pelasgian epoch, but transmitted through the numerous and important Greek colonies in Spain, whose inscriptions exist to this day.

We must remember that 'forane' and 'alien' in English were both 'forain' words, derived from Medieval French, and yet have driven out such Old-English equivalents as *utacunda*, *utanbordes*, *utan-cumen*, *utcuma* and *utlic*. There is no other word for it in Baskish except 'er-beste-ko', and this seems to be of more modern formation, answering to the English 'outlandish'. There are, as Mr. Dodgson wittily says, many other such oddities in Baskish, which has lost even its native word for the colour 'green'. And as for the termination '-tz', other instances exist, derived from Latin and Greek words ending in *s*, e. g., *bihotz* (= heart) from *βίος*, *corputz* from *corpus*, *laphitz* from *lapis*, etc.

In conclusion we may say that no student of Baskish should fail to make use of this book and the previous volumes of the *Parsing* or *Analytical Synopsis*. Mr. Dodgson hopes to complete it, so as to cover the whole New Testament. He possesses the rest in manuscript; and it is much to be wished that he may find among the philological or other learned societies of Europe or America some help towards the publication of so valuable a work. No one who has honestly read Mr. Dodgson's very attractive book, or seen him at work upon it, can doubt of its eminent utility. We hope that the librarians of America will give it a hearty welcome.

PONSONBY M. P. VINCENT.

SCHOLAR OF PEMBROKE COLLEGE, OXFORD.



## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOGIE, Vol. LXVII (1912).

Pp. 1-10. De Graeco epigrammate sepulcrali Bonnensi. P. E. Sonnenburg. A study of IG XIV n. 2566, p. 676. The first line of the inscription should read: *Θεσσαλονείκη μοι πατρίς ἐπλετο, ὄνομα Δημό.* Perhaps the third line should be filled out by the words, *καὶ ἄκυρον ἦν λάχος ἀμόν.* The dog carved on the stone is not a symbol of Demo's fidelity, but the guardian of her tomb.

Pp. 11-19. Hiatusschau bei Dionys von Halikarnass und Textkritik. H. Kallenberg. In an earlier article (Rh. Mus. 1907, p. 28) the writer has shown that Dionysius, in spite of his fondness for the interjection *ὦ*, regularly omits it before a proper name which begins with a vowel, in order to avoid the hiatus. In this earlier study he took no account of the Roman names which begin with *οῦ* (= Lat. *v*), assuming that this was consonantal. But inasmuch as editors are apt to regard it as vocalic and to mark an elision before it, he now returns to the subject and deals with this special question. Dionysius cannot have regarded the *οῦ* as vocalic, for he freely uses both the interjection *ὦ* and the article *ὁ* (nom., gen., dat.) before such Roman names. Neither did he regard it as a diphthong, for he often allows it to follow a vowel ending which is not capable of elision. Elision before such names is very seldom marked in the MSS. of his works, and it should not be marked in our texts. A similar law may be laid down for the editors of Polybius, Diodorus and Plutarch.

Pp. 20-47. Der Abaris des Heraklides Ponticus. P. Corssen. A contribution to the history of the Pythagoras legend.

Pp. 48-66. Zum polybianischen Feldlager. Th. Steinwender. A study of the distribution of horse and foot in the early Roman camp. It is illustrated by a plan, p. 62.

Pp. 67-93. Der Codex Bosii der Dicta Catonis. M. Boas. Scaliger's statement that 'in libro vetustissimo Simeonis Bosii' the distichs were ascribed to *Dionysius* Cato was based only on a misunderstanding of a passage in Vinet's edition of Ausonius. The most important readings in Scaliger's edition were taken from the edition of Pierre Pithou, which was itself based mainly on Par. 8093 βγ.

Pp. 94-106. Korinthische Posse. Charlotte Fränkel. A study of a krater in the Louvre (published by Dümmler, *Annali*, 1885,



Tab. DE). One side shows two men stealing a jar of wine, the other shows the manner of their punishment. The name *Ὀμβρικός* (= *Ὀμβρικός*) suggests that one of them is an Umbrian slave.

Pp. 107-111. Zu Demosthenes. J. M. Stahl. Textual notes: XIX 257 (read ὑπ<οπτι> ἀκούσαντά τιν' αὐτοῦ κατήγορον); XXII 51 (read τῶν τ' ἄλλων ἕνεκα <καὶ τοῦ δήμου>); XXIII 51 (read κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο = gerade in diesem Falle); XXIV 1 (read πρὸς ὑμᾶς <προ> εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἀποτρέψομαι, and put a comma after προχειρότατον); XXIV 106 (read τοὺς ὄντας <κακουργοὺς> βελτίους ποιέει); XXV 37 (for εἰν οὖν read ἵν' οὖν); XXXIV 23; XLI 23 (read καὶ μηδὲν σημείον ὑμῖν ἔσται ὅτι κτλ); XLI 25 (for ὅμως read ὁμοίως); XLV 48.

Pp. 112-134. Zu den philosophischen Schriften des Apuleius. W. A. Baehrens. Textual notes.

Miszellen.—P. 135. J. M. Stahl. Zum Hymnus auf den Hermes. At 187 for γέροντα κνώδαλον read γέροντα κώκαλον. Cp. Hesych., κώκαλον παλαιόν, and Hom. Od. XIII 432, παλαιὸν γέροντος.—Pp. 135-137. A. Brinkmann. Zu Xenophons Poroi. The part of Aristides' Panathenaikos which is devoted to the praise of Attica is largely taken from Xenophon's Poroi.—Pp. 137-138. A. Laudien. Zur Ueberlieferung der Viten Plutarchs.—Pp. 139-141. L. Radermacher. Antiker Liebeszauber und Verwandtes. Note on Oxyrhynchus Papyri, II 219, especially on the words ἀλλ' ἐπιθεῖς λίθον ἑμαντοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν καθησυχάσομαι. Cp. the λίθος σωφρονιστήρ of the Heracles legend.—P. 142. G. Mercati and Eb. Nestle, Ὀξύρυγχος-Schrift.—P. 142. G. Krüger. Zu Bd. LXVI S. 632 ff. (Horat. Carm. 3, 17).—Pp. 142-146. E. Bickel. Iuvenaliana. Defence of the text, Sat. X 54.—Pp. 147-149. A. Werk. Bemerkungen eines Tierarztes zur Mulomedicina Chironis.—Pp. 150-151. K. Schrader. Zu den klassischen Studien des Johannes von Salisbury. There are a few passages in the Policraticus which are derived from Florus, not directly but apparently through Jordanes.—Pp. 151-152. A. v. Domaszewski. Eine Inschrift des P. Suillius Rufus. A nameless inscription which may refer to P. Suillius (Tac. Ann. 4, 31). It was found at Antioch (B. C. H. XXVI 161 n. 2 = CIL. III n. 14165<sup>14</sup>).

Pp. 153-173. Varia. Franz Rühl. The writer infers from Pharsalia, VIII 208, that Lucan did not regard Horace's 'terra-rum dominos', Od. I 1, 6, as in apposition with 'deos'. Textual notes: Capitolinus, Vita Pertinacis, 7. 9 (for 'senem quidem' read 'Severum quorum quidam'); Ib. 10. 9 (for 'nonnullarum' read 'novarum', or 'nonnullarum novarum'); Spartianus, Vita Severi, 17. 6; Pomponius Mela, III 47 (for 'plumbo' read 'plumbo albo'); Diodorus, XIII 3. 2; XVII 11, 5. Note on Herodotus' account of the Ionian revolt. Notes on Procopius, Bell. Vand. I 7; V 1.

Pp. 174-194. Straboniana. Beiträge zur Textkritik und Erklärung. H. Kallenberg.

Pp. 195-208. Vulgärlatein und Vulgärgriechisch. F. Pfister. An essay on the parallel development of vulgar Greek and vulgar Latin. The faulty use or omission of the article in N. T. Greek has its analogy in later Latin. 'ολίος for ὀλίγος recalls such forms as *ericens* for *erigens*, *maistri* for *magistri*. 'Από is used instead of a partitive genitive; so is *ab*, and more frequently *de*. Both *ἐν* and *ἐν* are used after verbs of emotion. Both *ἐν* and *ἐν* are used with the instrument. 'Από is used after a comparative; so is *ab*, and occasionally *de*. Both *εἰς* and *unus* are used with the meaning of the indefinite article. 'Εχειν and ποιεῖν govern a final infinitive; so do *habere* and *facere*. Both languages show a confusion of the relative and interrogative pronouns; in both languages the same verb or preposition may be used with different cases in the same sentence. Both languages show a 'nominativus pendens', a 'participium coniunctum' (instead of an ablative absolute), an accusative absolute, and a nominative absolute. Several of these phenomena have been wrongly classed as Hebraisms.

Pp. 209-225. Zu den neuen Carmina Latina Epigraphica. E. Löfstedt. Notes on some of the inscriptions in Engströms supplement to Bücheler's collection.

Pp. 226-239. Ein Einschiebsel in der Kranzrede des Demosthenes. J. M. Stahl. Sections 73-79 (as far as τοῦτοις ἡναντιούμην) are an interpolation—a forged text with forged documents.

Pp. 240-263. Die Schrift des Arztes Androkydes Περί Πυθαγορικῶν συμβόλων. P. Corssen.

Pp. 264-275. Zu den philosophischen Schriften des Apuleius. W. A. Baehrens. Textual notes on the Liber de Mundo.

Pp. 276-301. Eine bisher unbekannte Aesopübersetzung aus dem 15. Jahrhundert. Otto Tacke. Text of a translation of Aesop into Latin distichs written by Leonardo Dati, about 1428.

Miszellen.—Pp. 302-303. R. Schoene. Ad Aeneam Tacticum.—Pp. 304-305. W. Jaeger. Zu Aristoteles Metaphysik θ 9, 1051a 32 ff.—Pp. 306-309. Alfred Klotz. Vergils Vater. The Vita of the Scholia Bernensia was not taken directly from Donatus. Perhaps the word *figulum*, referring to the poet's father, is merely a corruption of *Virgilium*.—Pp. 309-312. E. Pilch. Zu Vergil's Arbeitsweise in den Georgica. The writer suggests that in Geor. I 50-59 Virgil has combined material which he drew from two different sources—Varro (50-55) and some unknown author (56-59). He finds evidence of a similar combination in the 'contradiction' between Geor. I 122, 'primusque per artem movit agros' (Iupiter), and I 147, 'prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram instituit'. That is, lines

121-124 plainly come from Hesiod (though Hesiod is not responsible for the statement that Jupiter invented agriculture, and, so, for the 'contradiction' to line 147), while line 147 is taken 'fast wörtlich' from Lucretius (V 14). As for Geor. I 185, he feels that, if Virgil had verified his references, or had known more than he did about farming, he would not have mentioned the 'curculio' as one of the plagues of the 'area'. In the second Georgic, lines 195-202 cannot be found in Varro, and 'therefore' must come from some other author. In the description of the young thoroughbred (Geor. III 75 ff.) lines 83-85—which apply to the full-grown charger rather than to the young colt—cannot be ascribed to Varro, and 'therefore' must be taken from some other (presumably poetical) source.—Pp. 312-316. W. A. Baehrens. Zur Quaestio Eumeniana.—Pp. 316-320. A. Elter. Zu Ps.-Xenophons Staat der Athener. Discussion of 1, 6 and 1, 10.—P. 320. J. M. Stahl. Nachtrag zu S. 110 f. The writer promptly withdraws his proposal to read  $\delta\tau\iota$  for  $\delta\iota\acute{o}\tau\iota$ , Dem. XLI 23.

Pp. 321-357. Rhetoren-Corpora. Hugo Rabe.

Pp. 358-390. Zur Kritik einiger ciceronischer Reden (pro Caelio und de domo). Alfred Klotz.

Pp. 391-416. Die  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}$  und ihre Reform unter dem Archon Nausinikos. J. M. Stahl. Under the system established by Solon the property qualifications of the first three classes were in the proportion of 5 : 3 : 2, while their capital subject to taxation was as 5 :  $2\frac{1}{2}$  :  $\frac{5}{8}$  (or, 1 :  $\frac{1}{2}$  :  $\frac{1}{8}$ ). These ratios were not disturbed by the reform in B. C. 378-7. The only change made in that year, and that merely a formal one, was that the tax was, for convenience, reckoned upon only a fifth of the taxable capital.

Pp. 417-424. Zum Abaris des Herakleides Ponticus. A. Rehm.

Pp. 425-471. Der leidende Hercules des Seneca. E. Ackermann. A defence of the genuineness of the poem.

Pp. 472-477. Orphica. L. Radermacher. Notes on I. G. XIV 641, 1, 2, 3.

Miszellen.—Pp. 474-479. A. Körte. Ein Zeugnis für Menanders Heros. In Menander's Heros there is a slave, Davus. Perhaps the variant *Davusne* in Horace, A. P. 114 (intererit multum *divusne* loquatur an *heros*) means that some one knew Menander's play and thought Horace was referring to it.—Pp. 479-480. W. Bannier. Zu CIA II 707.—P. 480. Erich Krüger. Zu Vergils Arbeitsweise: ecl. X. 38 f. The sources of lines 38-39 are Asclepiades (A. P. V 210) and Theocritus (X 27-28).

Pp. 481-514. Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik des Aischylos. E. Scheer. I. Die Adler Ag. 115 ff. Ch. 246 ff. In Ag. 145 for  $\sigma\tau\rho\upsilon\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$  perhaps read  $\tau\acute{o}\rho\gamma\omega\nu$ . In Ag. 119 read  $\lambda\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\varsigma$

ἐρικούματα φέρματα γέννας. II. Der Sturm Ag. 661-666. III. Parodos der Choeph. 61-74 Mordblut. IV. Der Zorn der Geister und die wilde Jagd Ch. 269-290.

Pp. 515-555. Zur Stilistik der älteren griechischen Urkunden. W. Bannier.

Pp. 556-568. Isidori Hispalensis 'Institutionum disciplinae'. A. E. Anspach.

Pp. 569-590. Zur Technik der lateinischen Panegyriker. J. Mesk. The results of this study indicate that Paneg. X (II) and XI (III) are by the same author, and that there is a close connection between Paneg. V (VIII) and the speech of Eumenius, IX (IV).

Pp. 591-608. Politische Tendenzgeschichte im 5. Jahrhundert n. Chr. Otto Seeck. The Historia Augusta was all written in the reign of Honorius—the life of Clodius Albinus, toward the end of 409, the latest lives, perhaps in the second half of 410.

Pp. 609-630. Scriptio continua und Anderes. A. Brinkmann.

Pp. 631-637. Die Heimat der Phönissen des Euripides. P. Corsen. The writer examines, and rejects, Gilbert Murray's suggestion that the women of the chorus are Carthaginians.

Miszellen.—Pp. 638-639. J. M. Stahl. Nachtrag über die εἰσφορά.—Pp. 639-640. M. Wallies. ὁξύρυγχος-Schrift.—P. 640. K. Preisendanz. Anth. Pal. V 191. The διπλοῦν γράμμα is *σν, σι*. "Σν vertauscht ergibt *vs, vs*. So erscheint die entkleidete Hetäre, von der man ihrem Namen nach manches Schöne erwarten sollte!"

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

# PHILOLOGUS LXX (N. F. Bd. XXIV), 1911.

## Second Part.

XII, pp. 321-352. A. Roemer, Aristarchea II. Continued from VII, pp. 161-212. Aristarchus and the πολύσημος λέξις in the light of our manuscript tradition. In spite of the confusion due to ignorance of the excerptors, it is clear that Aristarchus, in his ὑπομνήματα on the several books, in a given passage, emphasized by *νῦν* or *ἐνταῦθα*, the special meaning at that place of a word which had several meanings. On this theory, all passages which do not conform to this type, because they have been garbled by excerptors and scholiasts, should be restored to their original form.

XIII, pp. 353-396. J. Baunack, *Hesychiana*, I. Discussion of 50 words or word-groups presenting dialectic or other peculiarities or difficulties. Continued in XV, pp. 449-491.

XIV, pp. 397-437. C. Ganzenmüller, *Aus Ovids Werkstatt*. Continued from XI, pp. 274-311. Very full lists are given with some discussion of the verses in which Ovid repeats or copies himself. Though he copies, to an extraordinary degree, Greek and Roman writers, and often repeats himself, he has the art of repeating phrases with pleasing variations. These facts may be of practical value in the text-criticism of Ovid (cf. pp. 435-436) and in helping us discover the names of some of the persons to whom several of the epistles are addressed.

#### Miscellen.

8, pp. 438-442. K. Lincke. *Phokylides, Isokrates und der Dekalog*. The pseudo-Isokratic paraenesis to Demonikos is a collection of various exhortations to virtue reminiscent of Hesiod, Theognis, Phokylides and other poets. It is by some pupil of Isokrates who used the Nikokles as a model. As it is cited in the 3d cent. B. C. it points to an even earlier date for the didactic poem of Phokylides. The latter contains a genuine Pythagorean-Orphic nucleus. The opening words offer an independent religious code of morals, which bears comparison with Leviticus 19 and the decalogue. The poem is a monument of the influence of the Pythagorean ethics on the Mosaic writings.

9, pp. 442-445. E. Ströbel, *Zu Ciceros Reden in Pisonem und pro Flacco*. Additions to the critical apparatus in Clark's edition, vol. II (Oxford, 1909).

10, pp. 445-448. K. Meiser, *Zu Theophrasts Charakteren*. Emendations are proposed to: 1, 4; 4, 12; 5, 8; 6, 7; 7, 4; 8, 2; 14, 12; 16, 2; 20, 5; 23, 2; 28, 2; 28, 9; 29, 3.

11, p. 448. A. v. Domaszewski, *Ἰουλία νεωτέρα*. (1) The inscription from Anazarbus 94, v. 2, p. 38 of *Denkschriften d. Wien. Ak. B.* 44 (1896) is emended to: *εὐνοῦχος βασιλίδος Ἰουλίας νεωτέρας τ[ροφεύ]ς*. The lady is the daughter of Styra and the Julia mentioned in Ditt. IGO n. 735, I and II. Perhaps King Philopator of Tac. Ann. I. 42 was her brother. (2) In Insc. p. 17. n. 59 (Heberdey and Wilhelm) read *ὑποδημ(ατο)υργός* some inferior official connected with the cult of the goddess.

XV, pp. 449-481. J. Baunack, *Hesychiana* II. Continuation of XIII, pp. 353-396. 50 additional notes.

XVI, pp. 492-498. S. Mekler, *Die Medea-Fragments des britischen Museums*. Text and critical notes. The best preserved passage, col. III 13 ff., apparently contains an attack by Medea on the family of the heralds in the style of the well-known Euripidean harangues, but Mr. Bell's revised readings offer no certain basis for supplying the lacunae.



XVII, pp. 499-502. A. Schöne, *Zu Thukydides I*, 36. The confusion in the text can be removed by transposing the words *μὴ δεξαμένον . . . ἐσόμενον* to a place after *τὸ μὲν δεδίδς αὐτοῦ* and by putting *τὸ δὲ θαρσοῦν* after *ἐσόμενον*.

XVIII, pp. 503-510. J. Bergmann, *Die Rachegebete von Rheneia*. The text, together with a discussion, of a Bucharest gravestone inscription. It was written by a Greek Jew of the dispersion, who used the prayer-formulas current in the place of his abode, but called upon the one God in words and phrases from the Bible, as is almost always the case in Hebrew grave-inscriptions.

XIX, pp. 511-519. K. Lincke, *Plato, Paulus, und die Pythagoreer*. Traces of the influence of Plato's *Timaios* may be seen in the stoic and Christian schools and in the Pauline Epistles. Plato depicts the unity of the beautiful and complete Cosmos in the person of the Creator as a trinity: the father giving, space receiving, the child becoming. The Creator also assigns to the visible gods (the celestial star-souls) and the lower company of demons and souls their respective activities. Philo of Alexandria under Platonic influence represents other created powers and beings as coöperating with God in the creation of the world, and serving as mediators between God and man. The Pauline teaching also recognizes "principalities and powers", which are only in part kindly disposed towards men. Christ brought it about that neither angels nor powers can separate the Christian from the love of God. In the Gospels, especially Mark, the emphasis is put upon Christ's fight against the demons, and how they recognized and obeyed him. This becomes clear from the standpoint of the Pauline Christology, in which we have to do with an individual literary phenomenon, the most individual that has ever been, on account of the contrasts which the writer unites in himself, to the end that he may be to the Jew a Jew and to the Greek a Greek. He is Judaistic in his peculiar theory of grace: Greek, when, like Philo, he starts from the *Timaios* and other Platonic writings. Underlying the Pauline-Christian doctrine of redemption is Plato's *Phaidon*. The sayings "the prophet is not without honor save in his own country" and "they that are whole have no need of a physician" hark back to the Republic 489 a, b. In the Gospel according to Mark (worked over under Pauline influence) there are echoes of Platonic and other writings, especially Mark III, 11-VI, 56 (cf. Empedokles ed. Diels, frag. 111, 112, 114, 115). The writer did not wish the Messiah to be inferior to Zarathustra, Pythagoras, Empedokles and Plato.

XX, pp. 520-528. Fr. Poland, *Zum griechischen Vereinswesen*. I. The inscription in Pamphylian dialect (from Sillyon, CIG III 4342 C<sup>3</sup>) sheds light on the origin of certain societies for the young and old in Asia Minor, which came more prominently



to the fore in imperial times. This inscription of the 4th cent. B. C. refers to the founding of a club-house for young men and old for the public welfare and the furtherance of peace. There is a clear Dorian influence. II. The Ostrakon Lamer (Z. f. aeg. Sprache u. Altertumskunde, 48, 1910, S. 168 ff.) enriches our knowledge of the activities of clubs in Hellenistic Egypt. The few lines of the ostrakon show a certain unity in the development of these Greek club-organizations.

XXI, pp. 529-538. W. H. Roscher, Das Alter der Weltkarte in 'Hippokrates' *περὶ ἐβδομάδων* und die Reichskarte des Darius Hystaspis. The former is shown to be the older, having been made in the 6th cent. B. C., before the capture of Miletus by the Persians.

XXII, pp. 539-548. G. Thiele, Martial III, 20. Read: an aemulatur improbi *logos* Phaedri. *logos*=apologos (cf. Sen. Consol. 8, 3.) improbi=audacious; used because of the political criticisms in Phaedrus' fables.

XXIII, pp. 549-560. O. Leuze, Die Darstellung des I. punischen Kriegs bei Florus. Florus' picture is true only in the most general points. This estimate holds for other parts of the work. Uncorroborated data found in Florus must always be looked upon with suspicion. His version may not be claimed for the "Roman annalistic tradition" without closer inspection, especially in the restoring of Livy (i. e. the Epitome) his work must be used with extreme caution.

#### Miscellen.

12, pp. 561-564. O. Crusius, Διόνυσος κεχηνός. Zu Kallimachos Epigr. 48. The poem is an academic *παίγνιον*.

13, pp. 564-565. O. Crusius, Hesychius, *ἐς ἰωνίαν*. The meaning *ἐς κοπρῶνα* is probably correct. The dung-heap is called 'violet-bed' *κατ' ἀντίφρασιν*.

14, pp. 565-569. L. Straub, Ueber Thukyd. III, 84. The passage is certainly Thucydidean, notwithstanding the suspicions of the scholiast.

15, pp. 569-570. A. v. Domaszewski, Ein unerkanntes Fragment des Monumentum Apolloniense. A fragment belonging to the close of the third column and corresponding to Mon. Ancyr. Gr. 7, 9-21 was erroneously published as a municipal honorary inscription by Anderson in Jour. of Hellen. Studies 18 (1898) 100, n. 43.

16, pp. 570-576. M. Manitius, Ein altes Priscianfragment. In Ms. Parisinus 12960 (St. Germain 1110) f. 116-125, Saec. IX.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

## BRIEF MENTION.

'Out of these convertites', says melancholy Jaques, 'there is much matter to be heard and learned', and there is much to be learned from Professor JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, who is a convertite and whose great work on *The Verse of Greek Comedy* (Macmillan) is, as he himself says, a manner of palinode. In 1878 he made the outlines of J. H. H. Schmidt's system known to such English and American scholars as were innocent of German by publishing a translation of Schmidt's Introduction. For this *amabilis insania* in propagating Schmidt's logaoedic theory he apologizes on the score of youth. Unfortunately, I cannot plead the same excuse, for six years before Professor WHITE, though apparently unknown to him, I had put forth in my Latin Grammar of 1872 a system of Latin versification based on Schmidt (A. J. P. XXVI 359; XXIX 368). At that time I had already reached the dead line of forty, but what they call the dead line of forty is really the 'dangerous age' spoken of by Karin Michaelis (A. J. P. XXXII 481), and I became enamoured of the system, so that when I undertook to edit Pindar I applied to Schmidt himself for his latest views on Pindar's metres, and received from his generous hand (*ἀφνειὰς ἀπὸ χειρὸς*) the text of his unpublished Pindar, with his metrical schemes, as is duly set forth in the Introductory Essay of my edition. Shortly after my Pindar was published, Studemund, my charming Strassburg host of 1880, sent me his *Anecdota varia Graeca musica metrica grammatica*, and I remember it as one remembers one's first chill; but I shook off the impression until other cold douches supervened, and, while I clung to the faith, I found that an advocacy of the logaoedic system required a knowledge of music such as I did not possess, and so I withdrew sadly from the metrical field and consequently from the Pindaric field, for in the robustness of my faith I had robustly insisted on the mastery of Pindaric rhythms as a preliminary to the appreciation of the poet (Pindar, I. E. lxiii). I cannot read Pindar without stress, and he who takes away stress and hold 'e caelo deripit ille deos', and I am left lamenting. Professor WHITE tells us 'that the reaction against the logaoedic theory of Aeolic verse is very strong on the Continent; its waves have hardly as yet reached the shores of England and America', but more than twelve years ago, in my *Oscillations and Nutations of Philological Study*, I made my moan about what those wild waves were saying:

Years ago one might have forefelt what was coming and some of us had to whistle our aforesaid equal bars to keep our courage up. It was with an

uneasy feeling that we noted the care with which the old metricians were resuscitated and no Westphalian or Schmidtian ought to be surprised to have the choriambi cantering over his head once more, to hear the triple watchdog growl of the molossus, or to see the banished antispast come back, the two long arms waving triumphant flippers at either end. . . . This special oscillation has prostrated many of us Greek scholars with deathly seasickness, and seasickness is apt to suspend all human sympathies. But we are not so immersed in our own troubles as not to note the oscillation that is going forward in other parts of the philological boat, as not to note the perpetual motion of the Saturnian, as not to note the 'Hebung und Senkung', the 'Senkung und Hebung' of Germanic metres, and the ups and downs of English metricians, Guest in one decennium and Schipper in another. It is metre and no end, μέτρον ἀμετρον, all over the face of the philological deep. (Compare also C. W. E. Miller on Masqueray A. J. P. XX (1899) 331).

---

Of the three Graces of Greek lyrical composition, two are hopelessly lost, two that occupy the foreground of the First Pythian. The footstep of the dancer is not seen, the voice of the singer is not heard—footstep and voice that obeyed the quiver of the lyre's strings—and the lyre itself is mute. The stately epitrites have lost their stride. We cannot conceive dance without footfall, we cannot appreciate music without its heart-beat. Take away ictus, take away stress, and we cannot understand the immortal figure of Pindar's eagle, *τεαῖς ῥιπαῖσι κατασχόμενος*. Is there no ictus in *ῥιπή*? Well, if the ictus must go, let it go, but not without a last sigh; and sighing is rising and falling—a manner of ictus after all—and if the ictus is not to be allowed in verse, there must have been ictus elsewhere. Of 'Arbeit und Rhythmus', Arbeit alone is left, and I grant that there is no end of 'Arbeit' in metric, no end of work that we must respect in Professor WHITE'S crowning achievement of a long life of study. But the truth is the truth, and if he is right, we must acquire a keener sense of proportion than we have ever had, or humbly acknowledge that we are of too gross a nature to cope with the subtleties of Greek art. And we must read as we never read before Archilochos' command: *γίγνωσκε δ' οἷος ῥυσμός ἀνθρώπου ἔχει*. There is no life of ups and downs, only a life of longs and shorts.

---

For all that and all that I have had much joy out of the methods that Professor WHITE has renounced, and I have sought and fancied I had found the *ῥθος* of many measures in which it seems there is no *ῥθος* at all. True, it was a blow to me when Wilamowitz in his *commentariolum metricum*, took away all character from the Glyconic family (A. J. P. XVI 394). The character, it appears, must be sought in the music, which is lost, and what tricks the musical *tempo* can perform we all know.

Change the *tempo*, and Yankee Doodle becomes a dirge; and all our fancies as to the character of this metre and that are clouds like the old methods of interpreting Pindar, which, to quote the same high authority, have—thank God—vanished forever. When I read those fatal words, I rolled up my lecture on Sappho and thrust it into the columbarium in which repose my lucubrations on literary topics, for I had insisted at some length on the symbolism of Sapphic and Alcaic. Perhaps I shall be pardoned, if I reproduce the musings of thirty years syne, which prove so baseless to-day. And if all this egotism seems deplorable, let the reader—benevolent or malevolent—remember that the freedom of *Brief Mention* is all the reward I have for the dreariness of the editor's task (A. J. P. XXV 490).

Alkaïos and Sappho are figured together on a well-known vase—Alkaïos with sunken head, his lyre in his hand upright; Sappho with indignation had put her lyre under her arm—and in the famous picture by Alma Tadema the two singers are brought face to face. Mr. Wharton in his pretty book on Sappho has had the vivid countenance of Alma Tadema's Sappho engraved as a frontispiece, and the picture is one of the treasures of Baltimore. A semicircle of marble seats, veined and stained, a screen of olive trees that fling their branches against the sky, against the sapphire seas, a singing man, a listening woman, whose listening is so intense that nothing else in the picture seems to listen—not the wreathed girl in flowered robe who stands by her and rests her hand familiarly on her shoulder. Not she, for though she holds a scroll in her other hand, the full face, the round eyes, show a soul that matches wreathed head and flowered robe. She is the pride of life. Nor she on the upper seat, who props her chin with her hand and hides her mouth with her fingers and lets her vision reach into the distance of her own musings. Nor her neighbor whose composed attitude is that of a regular church-goer who has learned the art of sitting still and thinking of nothing. Nor yet the remotest figure—she who has thrown her arms carelessly on the back of the seat and is looking out on the waters as if they would bring her something. A critic tells us that the object of the poet is to enlist Sappho's support in a political scheme of which he is the leader, if not the chief prophet, and he has come to Sappho's school in Lesbos with the hope of securing another voice and other songs to advocate the views of his party. The critic seems to have been in the artist's secret, and yet Alma Tadema painted better than he knew. Alkaïos is not trying to win Sappho's help in campaign lyrics. The young poet is singing to the priestess of the Muses a new song with a new rhythm, and as she hears it, she feels that there is a strain of balanced strength in it she has not reached: it is the first revelation to her of the rhythm that masters her own. True, when Alkaïos afterwards sought not her help in politics, but her heart in love, and wooed her in that rhythm, she too had caught the music and answered him in his own music.

And here follows the analysis of a much earlier date:

The Sapphic strophe is the feminine complement of the Alcaic, and if you will examine the schemes of the two, you will see at a glance the resemblances and the differences. They are both logaoedic, different from the ordinary heavy dactyls and trochees in quantity, and in a sharper secondary stress on the part not under the chief ictus. These rhythms are much used in Greek whenever emotion rises, not above the prose level, but above the ordinary poetic level. They are the reigning rhythms in those portions of tragedy in which the agony has not been reached or has passed. They are the very rhythms for the quick Aeolian μέλος, with its rapid flight. Then the

number of bars are the same in the first two lines, and the mass of dactyls and trochees about the same. Take off the preliminary beat, and the measures are identical, except that the Alcaic pauses just before the end. But that preliminary beat makes all the difference. It gives the vigorous ascent, the manly preparation for the onset. . . . . The man plunges into the Aegean Sea of passion, but he poises himself before he goes. The woman 'moveth altogether, if she move at all'. It is a symbolism of the fabled leap from the Leucadian rock.

Another great difference is to be seen in the further development of the stanza. Five bars constitute a restless measure, a measure which cannot balance itself. Indeed, four is by far the most common measure in Greek poetry—so common that some scholars have attempted to reduce all the tragic rhythms to fours. Both man and woman begin with unrest—indeed, the man is more restless than the woman, if one may judge by these impatient poems. But notice that the man overcomes sooner. In the third verse the manlier element preponderates, and the rhythm is in fours. True, passion returns in the last verse, and with redoubled force, in the quick waves of the two dactyls, but these are held in check by the quieter trochees, and the two restless fives are brought to calm by the more sober fours. It is the rhythm of passion that has been overcome. But in the Sapphic strophe the restless rhythm is repeated thrice, and there is no peace, except the peace of exhaustion. The little clausula at the end is a last effort to repeat the characteristic movement of the verse—is, as it were, the incomplete echo of the cry of yearning love, of passionate invocation.

---

But however wedded one may be to the system represented by Schmidt, it must be confessed that in the domain of the non-melic verse it gives little help, and in the exact study of iambic trimeter and trochaic tetrameter, in anapaestic and dactylic verse, Professor WHITE's labours will be welcomed by all scholars, whatever view they take of fundamental principles. This is the line which Bentley and Porson and other English scholars opened up to an admiring world; this is the line on which I was taught to work by my German masters, and many an hour of my student life have I spent in just such labours as those by which Professor WHITE has earned himself an abiding place in the annals of metrical study. But those who have not learned to appreciate the exactness of Greek art, will turn away from these columns of figures, just as they underrate the value of statistical syntax, just as they are left cold by the mathematical formulae that control the proportions of a Doric column. The application of the infinitesimal calculus is a tribute to the finer artistic sense of the Greeks, and even the besotted slaves of the ictus can understand why certain combinations of shorts are forbidden, why the tripping tribrach must perform a manner of egg-dance, why tribrach and anapaest may not follow dactyl in the iambic trimeter, and why dactyls overlap forward when they overlap, and overlap backwards only when they fall from grace. Porson's law of the final cretic is one of the famous discoveries of what we may call the digital part of metric—*digitis callemus et aure*. The aural explanation, so to speak, is to be sought in



the greater unity of the verse, and if the rule applies only to tragedy, why that is one proof the more of the diversity of tragedy and comedy—a diversity which extends to origin as well as technique. And so we can understand why Professor WHITE, who insists so much on metrical traditions, has espoused the seductive *ἀγών* theory, suggested by Bergk, carried on by Rossbach and Westphal, and demonstrated by Zielinski and Humphreys. One remembers how this *ἀγών* theory was scouted at first because of the utter lack of traditional evidence. One remembers the bubbly-jock protest of Kock, when it was first promulgated (A. J. P. XV 258 where read 'Clouds'); and yet Professor WHITE, who holds us to the law and testimony of the metres, accepts joyfully the whole system and has himself brought up from the silent past an unrecognized actor in Greek comedy.

---

Needless to say, no such fancies as the one I have recklessly exposed cloud the clear pages of such a wonderful record of work as Professor WHITE'S. But it would be doing him a gross injustice not to recognize amid the reserve, so characteristic of the man and his environment, abundant evidences of artistic sensitiveness. In discussing Merry's Aristophanes some years ago, I said that no commentator who neglects the metres of the poet can possibly reveal to the student all the fun (A. J. P. XXI 232), and I might cover pages with extracts from Professor WHITE'S book, in which the lion smiles at the comic effects produced by sequences of longs and shorts. To give a few specimens.

---

P. 37, à propos of Lys. 256-65 = 271-80: 'the form admirably expresses the sentiment,—indignant but unavailing complaint of querulous old men in the strophe, and exultant but buffoon reminiscence of past glory in the antistrophe. Here, as in Av. 851 ff., metre is made the means of special comic effect'. Again (p. 44), 'the spoken trimeter approaches as closely as possible to the speech of the man of the street'; and (p. 57), 'When a verse is divided between two speakers into four parts the effect is so odd as to be in itself eminently comical, which is the poet's intention'. (P. 63), 'The melodramatic <παρακαταλογία> <iambic> tetrameter <catalectic> differs notably from the recitative both in use and in form. It is found only in debates, in which feeling runs high and the language is violent, often approaching Billingsgate'. (P. 149), 'With keen appreciation of the incongruity of form and content <Aristophanes> uses the heroic line in ordinary dialogue'. (P. 161), 'This constant shift of melody and the introduction of periods in other rhythms, especially in the last part of the lyric <Thesm. 1015-55>, are well



adapted to express Andromeda's agitation and anguish.<sup>1</sup> And when Professor WHITE contrasts the effect of the iambic tetrameter catalectic and anapaestic tetrameter, he unwittingly lends his sanction to the aberration of one who is οὐτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὐτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ in the whole field. P. 369 he says: 'It is not without significance that Aristophanes in his *Equites*, designing to out-Cleon Cleon, has his famous blackguard in the second debate carry on in iambic tetrameters the argument which Cleon has begun in anapaests (Eq. 713 ff.: 843 ff.)'. Here, at all events, is ground upon which we can meet (A. J. P. XVI 395):

Kleon is an heroic rascal, and evidently feels himself degraded by the necessity of fighting Agorakritos with his own weapons; but he cannot do otherwise, and the debate begun by Agorakritos in iambic tetrameter (v. 335) is necessarily kept up in the same; but when Kleon sets the pace (v. 763), he strikes out in the grand anapaestic tetrameter. But the chorus mischievously forces the controversy back into the iambic strain (835), and we see how Kleon is again compelled to occupy the same unheroic level with his antagonist. At the close Agorakritos rises with the chorus to anapaestic heights. Kleon's fate is to dwell in indecencies forever, and his curse is to ply the same trade as Agorakritos had plied, iambic tetrameter and all—οὐδὲν μέγ' ἄλλ' ἢ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξεῖ τέχνην.

And so, in view of all these glimpses that have made me less forlorn, in view of the vast service that Professor WHITE has rendered the study of Greek comedy, I am quite resigned to my fate, and will cease to grate on scrannel pipes of wretched straw my lament over the utter destruction of the schemes in which I once took delight. εὐφημεῖν χρὴ τὸν πρεσβύτερον καὶ τῆς εὐχῆς ὑπακούειν, for it is only a εὐχή after all, and it is sheer mockery in Professor WHITE to prefix to a volume of 479 pages the motto ταχύ γ' ἂν δύνατο μανθάνειν περὶ ῥυθμῶν. It is enough to drive one to the acceptance of Reiske's emendation, τάχα.

---

The third edition of WILAMOWITZ'S *Reden und Vorträge* (Weidmann) is enriched by the addition of five papers, to wit: the *Adonis of Bion*, the *Daphnis of Theokritos*, the *Festival of Demeter by Kallimachos*, the *History of Greek Religion*, and *Pindar*, the last named of which has naturally attracted me first as the work of one who both knows and loves the poet. It is an answer to the question, why of all the great Greek poets none is so little known, so little understood, as Pindar. It is a question I have asked myself, and answered in my own way. 'There is', I have said, 'an aristocratic disdain in Pindar's nature that yields

<sup>1</sup>Schmidt Kunstformen II, cccxxviii: Beliebige Formen folgen einander im buntscheckigsten Wechsel. . . . Zwei Sätze haben sogar eine Bauart, die in der classischen Poesie eine unerhörte ist, . . . dass sie hier vorkommt, wo Aristophanes eine verkehrte Compositionsart verspotten will, ist natürlich ein Zeugniß für die <oben> ausgesprochenen Grundsätze.

only to kindred spirits or to faithful service'. Bold would be the man who in this democratic age should claim a kindred spirit. 'Faithful service' can still be found, but it is rare. But another requisite for the understanding of Pindar is the experience of a losing side, and so evident were the traces of such an experience in my Introductory Essay that the publishers urged me to change some of the phrases on p. xii, out of deference to the prevalent sentiment of the country, an amusing reminiscence in the genial light of to-day. It is this point that WILAMOWITZ urges in order to account for Pindar's unpopularity in Germany. 'In Germany', he says, 'the past is studied chiefly from the historico-political side', and it seems that the descendants of those who fought in the great War of Liberation have no sympathy with the man who went with his state, the man who Medized, as his religious teachers of Delphi were accused of doing—another historical parallel, as absurd as most historical parallels are. 'Auch sie starben für das Vaterland', the inscription on the Munich monument to the Bavarians who perished in the Russian campaign, stirs no kindred feeling in the upholders of the German Empire, and WILAMOWITZ opens his praelection with a translation of Carducci's sonnet to Dante. Here is the original of what I dare not call 'Professorenpoesie', even with the qualification with which WILAMOWITZ has guarded the unlucky phrase:

Dante, onde avvien che i vóti e la favella  
 Levo adorando al tuo fier simulacro,  
 E me su'l verso che ti fe' già macro  
 Lascia il sol, trova ancor l'alba novella?

Per me Lucia non prega e non la bella  
 Matelda appresta il salutar lavacro,  
 E Beatrice con l'amante sacro  
 In vano sale a Dio di stella in stella.

Odio il tuo santo impero: e la corona  
 Divelto con la spada avrei di testa  
 Al tuo buon Federico in val d'Olonia.

Son chiesa e impero una ruina mesta  
 Cui sorvola il tuo canto e al ciel risona:  
 Muor Giove, e l'inno del poeta resta.

---

The German attitude towards Pindar is the attitude of Carducci towards Dante. Pindar's soul dwelt apart from the great cause of Greece against Persia, Hellene against Barbarian. His lofty praise of Athens has enhanced value coming from a Theban, but the liberation of Ionia left him cold. The Attic Empire threatened the independent existence of the little communities where his friends lived, the Athenian democracy was to him the

irreconcilable foe of the order in which he was rooted and grounded, and his art as well. His dislike for the Ionians shows itself in his treatment of that incarnation of the Ionians, Odysseus. He despised Archilochos, the master of Ionian poetry, and one of his most famous fragments shows that he would not accept the Ionian explanation of the eclipse of the sun. But it is our business to study the poet night and day, as Carducci studied Dante, and WILAMOWITZ'S essay is an effective incitement to the study, and needless to say illuminating. As specimens of Pindar's art he has selected for translation, the fragment (88) in which the new star Delos swims into the ken of the immortals, the narrative of the Tenth Nemean, enough of itself to put Pindar among the great poets of the world, the last part of the Third Pythian, with its proud vindication of the poet's art—the opening of the Sixth Nemean—the favorite of Wilhelm von Humboldt—and the close of the Eighth Pythian, Pindar's last poem and one of his very best—the *σκιὰς ὄναρ ἀνθρώπου* poem, a shadow for us, a trailing cloud of glory for the poet. WILAMOWITZ'S renderings have the swing of the translator. The broidity of Pindar is unattainable.

---

Nothing would seem to be more characteristic of an author's style than a propensity to parenthesis, whether due to the impetuosity of genius or the feebleness of mental digestion. This is just one of those things that lend themselves to the tabulatory art of the statistician. Many years ago I wrote (*Essays and Studies*, p. 148): 'Some one with a turn for computation has counted the parentheses in <Carlyle's> *Reminiscences*, and it is much to be wished that the same observer had watched the rise and growth and general norm of parentheses in Carlyle'. But that wish remained a *pium desiderium*; and a *pium desiderium* is the wish that the President of the Women's Browning Club of Chicago had tabulated the parentheses in Browning before she abandoned the study of the poet in disgust because 'she had got on to his curves' (A. J. P. XXXII 482). And now in the fulness of time one of the Schanz collaborators, Dr. C. GRÜNEWALD,<sup>1</sup> has taken up the subject of Parentheses in the Ten Attic Orators (*Die Satzparenthese bei den zehn Attischen Rednern*: Würzburg, Kabitsch). He excludes from consideration, as well he may, such little interjected phrases as *οἶμαι*, *πολλεὺ γε δεῖ*, and all clauses that stand in organic connexion with the main sentence—relative, final, conditional, and the like. The true parenthesis is an independent sentence taken up into the body of the main sentence. This parenthetical structure,

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confounded with L. Grünwald, to whom we owe the treatise on the Formulaic Infinitive (A. J. P. X 381), where the name appeared as Grünwald, for which I make this belated apology. We should have had fewer parentheses in Greek historical writing, if footnotes had been invented.

which modern grammarians consider an offence against the laws of an orderly sequence of thought, Dr. GRÜNEWALD undertakes to defend. That cannot be artistically a sin which is employed so freely by the Attic Orators, and especially by the most artistic of all—Isokrates and Demosthenes. We have to do not with an evidence of lack of control, but with a conscious device of art to produce the effect of nature. It contributes to the rejuvenescence of language, to the art of arts, which is *celare artem*. And so Dr. GRÜNEWALD has given us a special chapter on the psychological rhetoric of the parenthesis, and the art of ἡθικῶς λέγειν. In the early orators, Antiphon and Andokides, the parenthesis serves simply logical purposes. In Lysias, half his parentheses are logical, half rhetorical; and the same thing is true of Isaios, whose close imitation of Lysias, by the way, becomes more and more evident the more he is studied. The long career of Isokrates prompts to the division into periods, from which it appears that the old man eloquent makes more use of parentheses in his later than in his earlier speeches, with a vast preponderance of the rhetorical sort. In Demosthenes' first period there are few parentheses—only one parenthesis to eighteen paragraphs. In the second period the number of parentheses mounts, so that the average shews as many as one parenthesis to ten paragraphs, with some notable contrasts. There are a great many in I and II, the second Olymthiac rising to the height of one parenthesis to five paragraphs. Next to the lowest is the famous LIV, where one would look for 'naturalism', despite Bruns (A. J. P. XXV 356). In the third period the De Corona shews one parenthesis to seven paragraphs. Most of the parentheses in Aischines have, according to Dr. GRÜNEWALD, a rhetorical coloring. Lykurgos, the academic, has only one example to 49 paragraphs, and the three examples, §§ 52, 90 and 95, are all rhetorical. Deinarchos, the κρίθινος Δημοσθένους, like Demosthenes, makes considerable use of rhetorical parentheses. Hypereides does not lend himself to definite conclusions, but in him also the rhetorical parenthesis preponderates. This is about as much as the average reader will care to know of Dr. GRÜNEWALD's treatise, which is an extract from the *Festgabe für Herrn Geheimrath Dr. Martin von Schanz* in commemoration of his seventieth birthday, June 12, 1912.

---

The project of a *Greek Thesaurus* which should hold the wealth of the language from the earliest times down to a late Byzantine period fell from its own weight (A. J. P. XXX 112), to be succeeded by another, far more feasible, and one which is the necessary condition of the greater work, if it should be resumed under the same auspices. The plan of the new Thesaurus embraces the period from Homer to Aristotle, and living men may hope to see its accomplishment. In an interesting

*Promemoria*, Professor KRETSCHMER, of Vienna, one of the leading collaborators, has given a sketch of the original scheme, which was naturally suggested by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Diels, it seems, in his *Elementum* (1899) was one of the first to give lively expression to what he considered the hysteron proteron of a Latin Thesaurus before a Greek Thesaurus. In view of the enormous influence of Greek on the whole world of thought, the history of Latin words, their origin, their semantic, could not be properly set forth, he maintained, until the Greek material had been collected and scientifically digested. Of course, he recognized, as every one recognized, the great difficulties of the task on account of the vast compass of Greek literature. Five years after Diels' *contio ad clerum*, the matter was brought up by Sir Richard Jebb before a General Meeting of the International Association of Academies in London, May 26, 1904, and a committee was appointed with Sir Richard Jebb as chairman, made up of Diels, Gomperz, Heilberg, Leo, and Perrot. To this committee KRETSCHMER was added the next year. The death of Jebb soon thereafter was a great loss. His membership on the committee was given to Ingram Bywater, his chairmanship to Gomperz.

---

Of course, there was no question as to the need of such a Thesaurus. The edition of Stephanus by Hase and the Dindorfs, still indispensable, is patchwork, and the advance in our knowledge of every phase of the life of antiquity, the advance in criticism and hermeneutics, in archaeology, in epigraphics, in grammar, in etymology, makes a Greek Thesaurus one of the most pressing needs of Greek scholarship. But the trouble lay in the matter of limit, and it is this that has checked the progress of the Thesaurus thus far, and this question the promoters of the present plan, which is to be brought before the International Association of Academies this year, have solved for themselves by fixing the boundary at the time of Alexander the Great, reserving the whole mass of later Greek for a lexicon of its own. Twenty-nine authors are enumerated who are to be taken up into the Thesaurus as over against the two hundred and twenty-five of the Latin Thesaurus, and it is estimated that the material will be only a seventh as great as that of the Latin Thesaurus. An objection on the score of the great importance of the post-classic period, no less great than that of the classic time, is met by the consideration that a *Thesaurus linguae graecae antiquissimae* is no hindrance to the *Thesaurus linguae communis*, which can be taken up whenever provision has been made for the enormous expense attendant upon such an enterprise. Even the present project threatens to task the financial resources of the associated academies, and an appeal has been



made or will be made to classical associations in this country for regular contributions to the support of a project which is as international in its scope as Greek is international.

---

That to the Greek 'accent', which were better called 'tone', was pitch, appears clearly enough from the nomenclature which was traditional as far back as Plato. Was this pitch accompanied by stress? '<It was>', as can now be proved', said the author of Wheeler's Law in 1893, and it was in 1893 that Jakob Wackernagel undertook to prove it. In 1913 HUGO EHRLICH, with all respect for Wackernagel—a respect which everybody shares, and I not least,—has devoted a volume to disproving it. In the process of the ages, it is true, pitch has become stress, as in Modern Greek; but that is a familiar phenomenon in linguistic history, and in his *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung* (Weidmann), a book of much more varied interest than its title would disclose, EHRLICH has upheld the contention that there is no trace of the influence of accent, considered as stress, in the language of Homer—for the whole work revolves about the language of Homer. Expiratory influences are not felt before the middle of the fourth century B. C.; they are much stronger and earlier in the lower stratum of folk-speech than in the language of the cultured, and at the start prevalently outside the mother country. For the treatment of phonetic history in the domain of Greek, we must hold to the general principle that in the older period linguistic changes are independent of accent—a result which one finds emphatically stated in Vendryes' manual (1904). This is the conclusion, but I cannot undertake to summarize the processes by which the conclusion is reached. The book is fascinating, despite the column after column of evidence; and yet such is human nature that the things that interested me most are the confirmations of my own contentions, such as the originally adnominal nature of the genitive (A. J. P. XXIII 22), and the choriamic scanning 'Αρρείδας, which he upholds against Ludwig, against Brugmann (A. J. P. XIX 115. My appeal was to Pindar, P. XII 11, 31; I. 8, 15 and Πηλείδας Pr. 6, 25). Ehrlich's is to the *Correptio Attica* of 'Οτρυντείδης.

---

No American scholar that I can recall ever made so strong an impression on his contemporaries in so short a life as did Mortimer Lamson Earle, for whom great lamentation was made when he was called away (A. J. P. XXVI 454-456). In the limited space assigned to reviews, no room has as yet been found for a critical study of the volume which a few years ago pious hands consecrated to his memory, with its many evidences

of varied activity, of varied accomplishments, and this failure has been brought to my mind by the last number of the *Mnemosyne*, in which VAN LEEUWEN closes his eulogy of Earle with the words: *Laetas horas transegit multas, felix vixit, vixit honoratus suisque carissimus, prius autem hinc abiit quam gravia ei fieri potuerunt vitae onera communia. Quicquid optimum haec vita habet, ei non defuit.* This note of triumph no one can better understand than one who has looked on the faces of dead comrades on the battle-field, and murmured, as he looked the untranslatable words: δι' ἐλαχίστου καιροῦ τύχης ἅμα ἀκμῇ τῆς δόξης μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ δέους ἀπηλλάγησαν. How many years Victor Hugo was to survive the verses he wrote in 1848:

J'ai fait ce que j'ai pu ; j'ai servi, j'ai veillé.

O Seigneur ! ouvrez moi les portes de la mort,  
Afin je m'en aille et que je disparaisse.

To every old man there comes a touch of envy in the retrospect.

---

In my far distant salad days we college boys used to repeat enthusiastically a poem by the late Joseph Addison Alexander, of Princeton, in glorification of the monosyllable. It begins, 'Think not that strength lies in the big round word', and may be found in several collections, such as Dr. Bombaugh's *Gleanings for the Curious* (p. 102). Themes like these never die, and an article on the same subject from the *Spectator* has been going the rounds of the press. Alexander's poem is supposed to be a *tour de force*, like 'Swiss Family Robinson in words of one syllable', but the English language does not require much forcing. There is a poem all in monosyllables by Chidick Tychborne, but there is nothing to shew that it is designedly monosyllabic. The *Spectator* has cited Tennyson. Why, if the writer had read Tennyson's *In Memoriam* with any attention he would have noticed that, while there is no monosyllabic stanza in the whole poem, in stanza after stanza the monosyllabic strain is broken by only one dissyllable. Miss O'Reardon, who is a student of English versification, informs me that long stretches of English poetry have yielded figures like these: Milton, a little more than seventy-six per cent of monosyllables; Dryden, seventy-three per cent; Pope, seventy-four; Johnson, seventy-three; Wordsworth, seventy-six; Coleridge, eighty (in the *Ancient Mariner* the monosyllables mount to eighty-four per cent); Byron, seventy-eight per cent. This monosyllabic character of the language is, as I have remarked elsewhere (*A. J. P.* XXX 354; XXXIII 229) a decided drawback in the matter of imitating antique metres; but the difficulty is not quite so great as

it seems, because, as Sweet has emphasized, in any natural utterance words are run together by what Sylvester calls a phonetic syzygy. By a certain class of people this phonetic syzygy is avoided in the interest of clear articulation, but to a cultivated ear nothing can be more offensive than the pronunciation of 'at all' in two distinct syllables. Nearly a score of years ago a writer in the *Nation* uttered his protest against the innovation, and Fitzedward Hall, who at the time was working at *A* for the Oxford Dictionary, without stopping to read the protest and fancying that an attack was made upon the correctness of the expression, rushed into print, and in a long article (*A Brace of Whims, Nation* lxiii, March 8, 1894) proved triumphantly that 'at all' is good English. Among other examples, 'Swear not at all' stands out conspicuously—a command hard to obey in circumstances like these.

---

In one of his Letters—unless a treacherous memory deceives me—Horace Walpole tells the story of an Italian *custode* who got so much into the habit of using the word 'blessed' in connexion with the relics he was exhibiting that he shewed with great emphasis a bit of the blessed fig-tree that Christ cursed. And in like manner knighthoods have been bestowed of late years in such numbers on prominent scholars, I have become so accustomed to Sir Richard, Sir William, Sir John, Sir Sidney, Sir Frederick, that in the last *Brief Mention* (A. J. P. XXXIII 485) Sir Gilbert slipped from my pen—doubtless a mere anticipation. Surely a priest of the Muses like Gilbert Murray is not too much honoured by a prefix once borne by Shakespeare's parsons, by Sir Topas and Sir Hugh.

---

The sudden death on February the twenty-third of HARRY LANGFORD WILSON in the fulness of his activity and at the height of his achievement has deprived the Journal of a valued contributor and the Johns Hopkins University of a learned, faithful, inspiring teacher. In its newly-elected President the Archaeological Institute of America has lost a man who had given proof of rare administrative ability. The scholarly world will miss the enthusiastic student, the larger public the luminous interpreter of the life and monuments of Ancient Rome. Nor will his loss be less felt in the community in which he shewed forth by precept and example the power of an unwavering Christian faith, and to which he has left the precious memory of a life consecrated to the highest ends.—B. L. G.

---

W. P. M.: The fourth part of *Das Erbe der Alten* (Leipzig: Th. Weicher, 1912), is contributed by Professor RUDOLF HIRZEL. It is a masterly sketch of the life and times of Plutarch, and of the wide and long-continued influence of his works. It shows not merely what Plutarch was to his own day, but what he has meant for Melanchthon and Erasmus, for Rabelais and Montaigne and Brantôme, for Corneille and Racine, for Shakespeare and Bacon and Dryden, for Rousseau, for Madame Roland, for Alfieri, for Emerson. It represents an enormous amount of reading, and every page is interesting. As might be expected of one who had long consorted with this particular author, Professor HIRZEL often indulges in 'modern instances', and sometimes sketches little 'parallel lives' of his own. The life of Plutarch himself is compared with the life of the historian Ranke, Themistokles is "the Attic Bismarck", Timoleon is "the old-world Garibaldi". Yet when he tells the story of Reuchlin's brilliant performance in the lecture-room of Argyropoulos at Rome (p. 111), he makes no reference to its prototype in Plutarch—the story of Cicero's brilliant performance in the lecture-room of Apollonios at Rhodes. Is this national pride, or mere reluctance to spoil a good story? And 1490—is the date right? Reuchlin's biographer Geiger insists that this happened in 1482. And some of our best works of reference say that Argyropoulos died before 1490. On p. 165 it is recorded that after the occupation of Vienna the great Napoleon—in conscious imitation of Alexander the Great—posted a guard before the house of Haydn. The second edition must quote from Milton's fine sonnet how "The great Emathian conqueror bid spare | The house of Pindarus." And it may be worth noting that Alexander's noble order is mentioned in 'E. K.'s' commentary on the Shepherds Calendar—in 1579, the year of North's translation of the Lives. The story on which Tennyson's tragedy *The Cup* is based comes from Plutarch, *De Mulier Virt.*, 257–8. The epithet in his poem Lucretius, 54, "the mulberry-faced dictator", is probably derived from the Life of Sulla, ii. And in Matthew Arnold's Westminster Abbey the allusion to Agamedes and Trophonios is based on the *Consolatio ad Apollonium*, xiv. There is one other incident which might well be mentioned in a German book. When Olympia Morata fled from the flames of Schweinfurt, in 1554, she left behind her copy of Plutarch's Lives—and all her other wordly goods. The book was soon after carried to Würzburg, and sold. But her old friend Joannes Sinapius happened to hear of it, and promptly restored it to its former owner. In a letter which accompanied it, he remarks that he is sending it "per Magistrum Vitum Grunbach . . . ut Vitus vitas exanimatis restituat; sit venia verbo".

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristotle. *De Motu Animalium* and *De Incessu Animalium*. Translated by A. S. L. Farquharson. 8°. 78 pp. *H. Frowde* (Clarendon Press). 2/ net.

— Nicomachean Ethics, *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit* I. Bayswater. Oxford Classical Texts. Cr. 8vo., Indian paper. *H. Frowde* (Clarendon Press). 5/.

— Works translated into English under the editorship of J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross. Vol. V. 8vo. *H. Frowde* (Clarendon Press). 12/6 net.

Athenae Cantabrigienses by C. H. Cooper and T. Cooper. 3 v. Reissue 8vo. *Macmillan*. 21/ net; ditto, vol. 3 only, 6/ net.

Catullus, Tibullus and *Pervigilium Veneris*. New York, *Macmillan*. 11+375 pp. 16°. (Loeb classical lib.) \$1.50 net.

Cicero: Letters to Atticus; with an English translation by E. O. Winstedt. In 3 v. V. 1, bks. 1-6. New York, *Macmillan*. 9+495 pp. 12°. (Loeb classical lib.) Cl., \$1.50 n.; leath., \$2 net.

— Masterpieces. Boston, *Little, Brown*, 1912. 329 pp. 12°. \$1.25 net.

Epictetus: Discourses and *Encheiridion*. Translated by T. W. Higginson. Boston, *Little, Brown*, 1912. 288 pp. 12°. \$1.25 net.

Euripides; with an English translation by A. S. Way. In 4 v. Vs. 3-4. New York, *Macmillan*. 16°. (Loeb classical lib.) Ea., \$1.50 net.

Justiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor. With introductions, commentaries, and excursus by J. B. Moyle. 8vo. 688 pp. *H. Frowde* (Clarendon Press). 14/ net.

Livy: Praefatio, liber primus. Edited by H. J. Edwards. New York, *Putnam*. 57+232 pp., map, fold. map. 16°. \$1.10 net.

Lucian, Lucian; with an English translation by A. M. Harmon. In 8 v. V. 1. New York, *Macmillan*. 12+471 pp. 16°. (Loeb classical lib.) \$1.50 net.

Lysiae Orationes. *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit* Carolus Hude. (Oxford Classical Texts.) Cr. 8vo. *H. Frowde* (Clarendon Press). 3/6; swd. 3/.

Norma Elegiacae. A standard for the writing of Ovidian elegiacs. Selected by R. L. A. Du Pontet. Cr. 8vo. 28 pp. *H. Frowde* (Clarendon Press). 1/ net.

Paine (W. L.) and Mainwaring (C. L.) *Lingua Latina; primus annus*. New York, *Oxford University*. 138 pp. Fold. pl. 12°. 50 c. net.

Paine (W. L.) and others. *Decem fabulae, pueris puellisque agenda*. New York, *Oxford University*. 94 pp. 12°. 40 c. net.

Philostratus: The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, with an English translation by F. C. Conybeare. In 2 v. New York, *Macmillan*. 15+591; 5+624 pp. Ea., \$1.50 net; leath., \$2 net.



Philostratus: In honor of Apollonius of Tyana; translated by J. S. Phillimore. In 2 v. New York, *Oxford University*. 128+141; 296 pp. 16°. \$2 net.

Plutarch: The translation called Dryden's, cor. from the Greek and rev. by A. H. Clough. 5 v. New York, *Bigelow, Smith & Co.* c. 1911. Pls. 8°. \$20.

Sophocles: With an English translation by F. Storr. In 2 v. V. 1. New York, *Macmillan*. 15+419 pp. 12°. (Loeb classical lib.) \$1.50 net; leath., \$2 net.

Tacitus: The histories. Translated, with introduction and notes, by W. H. Fyfe. In 2 v. New York, *Oxford University*. 208; 245 pp. 12°. \$2 net.

Theocritus and other Greek bucolic poets; with an English translation by J. W. Edmonds. New York, *Macmillan*. 28+527 pp. 16°. (Loeb classical lib.) \$1.50 net; leath., \$2 net.

Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta papyracea nuper reperta; recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Arthurus S. Hunt. New York, *Oxford University*. 12°. Pap., 60 c. net.

Varronis rerum rusticarum libri; 3; translated by Lloyd Storr-Best. New York, *Macmillan*. 31+375 pp. Front. 16°. (Bohn lib.) \$1.50 net.

Virgil: The Georgics. Translated by Arth. S. Way. New York, *Macmillan*. 117 pp. 16°. 90 c.

Wetmore (M. N.) Index verborum Catullanus. New Haven, Ct., *Yale University*. 115 pp. 8°. \$2.

White (J. W.) The verse of Greek comedy. New York, *Macmillan*. 30+479 pp. (6 p. bibl.) 8°. \$4 net.

## FRENCH.

Burnier (Ch.-E.) et Oltramare (A.) Chrestomathie latine. (*Payot et Cie*). 3.75.

Cagnat (René). Mélanges. Recueil de 25 mémoires concernant l'épigraphie et les antiquités romaines, 1 portr., in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 15 fr.

Cohen. Le parler arabe des juifs d'Alger. In 8. *H. Champion*. 25.

Cicéron. Œuvres choisies, par R. Beauchot, ill. (xxiv-842 pp.), in-16, rel. *Hatier*. 4 fr. 50.

Grenier (Albert). Bologne Villanovienne et Étrusque (VIII<sup>e</sup>-IV<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère), ill. et plans (Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 106) in-8°. 20 fr.

Lassere (P.) La doctrine officielle de l'Université. Défense et théorie des humanités classiques, in-18. *Mercure de France*. 3 fr. 50.

Leroux (G.) Vases grecs et italo-grecs du Musée archéologique de Madrid, fasc. 16, 55 pl., in-8°. *Fontemoing et Cie*. 25 fr.

Ménard (René) et Claude Sauvageot. Vie privée des anciens. T. II. La Grèce et l'Italie, nouv. édit. publ. par Edouard Rouveyre, in-8°. *E. Flammarion*. 5 fr.

Ovide. Les amours, trad. par de Bellefleur, 20 pl., in-8°. *J. Cheval*. 60 fr.

Reinach (Salomon). Répertoire de reliefs grecs et romains. T. III (fin). Italie-Suisse, 2,000 fig. T. I. et II. Les ensembles. Afrique. Îles Britanniques, in-8°, ch. vol. *E. Leroux*. 10 fr.

— Cultes, mythes et religions. T. IV, 39 grav., in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 7 fr. 50.

## GERMAN.

Bacchylidis carmina ed. Blass. Ed. IV curavit Guilelm. Suess. (lxxxii, 154 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 2.80; geb. in Leinw. 3.20.

Baehrens (W. A.) Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax. [Aus: *Philologus*.] (324 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1912. 9.

Carmina latina epigraphica. Post collectionem Buechelerianam in lucem prolata conlegit Einar Engström. (iv, 178 S.) gr. 8°. Gotoburgi, 1912. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. 3.

Commentationes philologiae Ienenses. gr. 8°. Lipsiae. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. Vol. X fasc. 1. Barwick (Carol.) De Platonis Phaedri temporibus. (iv, 76 S.) 1913. 3.20.

Forschungen in Ephesos, Mit 9 Taf. in Heliograv., 197 Abbildgn. im Texte u. 1 Beilage. 2. Bd. (ii, 230 S.) 41×32.5 cm. Wien, *A. Hölder*, 1912. geb. in Leinw. 80.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. Neue Aufl. Lex. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*. VIII. Bd. 2. Tl. II. Hälfte. Schanz (Mart.) Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. 2. Tl.: Die röm. Litteratur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian. II. Hälfte: Vom Tode des Augustus bis zur Regierg. Hadrians. 3., ganz umgearb. u. stark verm. Aufl. Mit alphabet. Register. (xiii, 601 S.) 1913. 10; geb. in Halbfrz. n. 12.

Helbig (Wolfg.) Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom. 3. Aufl. 2 Bde. (x, 634 u. iv, 547 S. m. 41 Fig.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912, 1913. geb. in Leinw. 24.

Herzog (Rud.) Die Umschrift der älteren griechischen Litteratur in das ionische Alphabet. Progr. (103 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich*, 1912. 3.

Homeri carmina ed. J. van Leeuwen J. F. Ilias. (lxv, 450 S.) gr. 8°. Lugduni Batavorum, 1912. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*. 9.

Kornemann (Ernst). Der Priestercodex in der Regia u. die Entstehung der altrömischen Geschichte. (viii, 74 S.) Lex 8°. Tübingen, *J. C. B. Mohr*, 1912. 2.

Kröll (Mich.) Die Beziehungen des klassischen Altertums zu den hl. Schriften des Alten u. Neuen Testaments. 3. Bd. Vollst. umgearb. u. verm. Aufl. (xiv, 146 S.) gr. 8°. Bonn, *C. Georgi*, 1913. 2.

Laqueur (Rich.) Polybius. (viii, 309 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1913. 10; geb. in Leinw. 12.

Libanii opera. Recensuit Rich. Foerster. Vol. VII. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana.) (xv, 739 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1913. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 15; geb. in Lein. 15.80.

Lysias' ausgewählte Reden. (XII. XIII. XVI. VII. XXII. XXIV.) Für den Schulgebr. hrsg. v. G. A. Kleffner. 2. Aufl. (xx, 108 S.) 8°. Münster *Aschendorff*, 1913. geb. 1.

Norden (Eduard). Agnostos theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. (ix, 410 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1913. 12; geb. in Leinw. 13.

— Aus Ciceros Werkstatt. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss." (S. 2-32.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *G. Reimer*, 1913. b 1.

Pindar: Siegeslieder. In Auswahl übertr. v. Carl Aug. Boethke. (xx, 139 S.) 8°. Jena, *E. Diederichs*, 1912. 3.50; geb. 4.80.

Plato's ausgewählte Dialoge. Erklärt v. C. Schmelzer. 4. Bd. Apologie. Krito. 2 Aufl., besorgt v. Hans Petersen. (iv, 84 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1912. 1.

Platonis dialogus, qui inscribitur Phaedrus. Recognovit I. C. Vollgraff. (vi, 154 S.) gr. 8°. Lugduni Batavorum, 1912. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*. 6.

Ptolemäus. Handbuch der Astronomie. 2. (Schluss-) Bd. Übers. u. m. erklär. Anmerkgn. versehen v. Karl Manitius. (VI, 446 S. m. Fig.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 8; geb. in Leinw. 8.60.

Sophokles. Erkl. v. Schneidewin u. Nauck. 5. Bdchn.: Elektra. 10. Aufl., besorgt v. Ewald Bruhn. (213 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1912. 2.

— Die Spürhunde. Ein Satyrspiel. Für die frei übers. u. ergänzt v. Carl Robert. (24 S. m. 1 T.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1912. 60.

Stobaei (Ioannisi) anthologium, recensuerunt Wachsmuth et Hense. Vol. V. Anthologii libri IV partem alteram ab Ottone Hense editam continens. Vol. III. (xxxvii u. S. 677–1157.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1912. 18.

Stucken (Eduard): Der Ursprung des Alphabets u. die Mondstationen. (iv, 52 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 1913. 7.50; geb. in Leinw. 9.

Sudhaus (Siegfr.) König Ödipus' Schuld. Rektoratsrede. (18 S.) gr. 8°. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*, 1912. 60.

Tacitus. Annalen in Auswahl u. der Bataveraufstand unter Civilis. Hrsg. v. Carl Stegmann. Text II. Annalen Buch XI–XVI. Historien Buch. IV–V. 3 Aufl. (S. 159–270.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. geb. 1.

— Germania. Hrsg. v. Osk. Altenburg. Text u. Namensverzeichnis. 3. Aufl. (iv, 68 S. m. 1 farb. Karte.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. geb. 80.

— dasselbe. Erklärungen. 2 Aufl. (72 S. m. 25 Abbildgn. auf 4 Taf.) 8°. Ebd., 1912. geb. 1.

Valeri Flacci C., Argonauticon libri octo. Ed. Otto Kramer. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana.) (lxxxvi, 218 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1913. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. geb. in Leinw. 3.60.

Vetschera (Rud). Zur griechischen Paränese. (Progr.) (34 S.) gr. 8°. Smichow b/Prag, *Selbstverlag*, 1912. 1.40.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v. Die Spürhunde des Sophokles. [Aus: Neue Jahrb. f. das klass. Altertum.] (28 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1913. 1.

## ITALIAN.

Inama (V.) Omero nell'età micenea. Milano. 16°. p. xii, 132. 3.50.

Mancuso (U.) La lirica classica greca in Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia. Pisa. 8°. 333 pp. 10.

Petronio Arbitro. Satyricon. Nuova edizione nella completa versione di Vincenzo Lancetti. Napoli. 16°. 210 pp. 3.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Abernethy (Julian W.) *Correct Pronunciation*. New York, *Charles E. Merrill Company*. 75 c.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Γράμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος κ', Τεύχος δ'. Ἐν Ἀθήναις. 1912.

British School at Athens, *Annual of the*. No. xiv, Session 1907-8. London, *Macmillan & Co.* 25s.

Burgundians, *The Linguistic and Ethnographic Status of the*. Runic Studies. Stanford University, 1909.

Caesar. *The Gallic Wars*, Bks. I-VII. Ed. by A. L. Hodges. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1909. \$1.25.

Curcio (Gaetano). *Q. Orazio Flacco studiato in Italia dal Secolo xiii al xviii*. (Biblioteca di Filologia Classica diretta da Carlo Pascal). Catania, *Francesco Battiato*, 1913. 5 L.

Eastern and Western Review. January, February, 1913. Ed. by I. I. Timayenis. Boston, Mass. @ 20 c.

Hart (Bernard). *The Psychology of Insanity*. Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1912. 40 c.

Haupt (Paul). *Joel's Poem on the Locusts*. Reprinted from *Hommage International à l'Université Nationale de Grèce à l'occasion du soixante-quinzième anniversaire de sa fondation*.

Heidel (W. A.) *Cornford's From Religion to Philosophy*. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology, and Scientific Methods*. Vol. X, No. 4. Feb. 13, 1913.

Hellenic Studies, *Journal of*. Vol. XXXII, Part II. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1912.

Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur (Die). Dargestellt von Fritz Baumgarten, Franz Poland, Richard Wagner. Mit 440 Abbildungen im Text, 5 bunten, 6 einfarbigen Tafeln. 4 Karten u. Plänen. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1913. 12 m. 50.

Henderson (Ernest F.) *Symbol and Satire in the French Revolution*. With 175 illustrations reproduced from original prints. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1912.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. von Friedrich Leo u. Carl Robert. XLVIII. Bd. I Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchh.*, 1913.

Huxley (Julian S.) *The Individual in the Animal Kingdom*. Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1912. 40 c.

Hyde (W. W.) *The Homeric Conception of the Divine Nature*. Four Lectures. Old Penn, December, 1912.

Ilias. Cum Prolegomenis, Notis Criticis, Commentariis Exegeticis. Ed. J. Van Leeuwen J. F. Lugduni Batavorum, A. W. *Sijthoff*, MCMXII. 9 m.

Johnston (Christopher). *Assyrian Kararu 'to wind' and Pilustu 'tablet'*. Reprint from *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*. Vol. XXIX, No. 2. Jan., 1913.

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Ed. by J. R. Jewett and Hanns Oertel. Vol. XXXII, No. 4. Leipzig, *Drugulin*, December, 1912. 6 m.

Juvenal, Fourteen Satires. Translated into English by Alexander Leeper. New and Revised Edition. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1912.

Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen u. Übungen. Herausg. v. Hans Leitzmann. 97. Diodors Römische Annalen bis 302 a. Christum samt dem Ineditum Vaticanum. Herausg. v. A. B. Drachmann. 1 M. 80. 98. Musaios. Hero u. Leandros. Mit ausgewählten Varianten u. Scholien. Herausg. v. Arthur Ludwich. 1 M. 50. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1912.

Knapp (Charles). The Dramatic Satire and Its Assailants. Reprint from the American Journal of Philology, XXXIII, 2, 1912.

Loiseau (L.) Tacite. Traduction nouvelle, mise au courant des travaux récents de la philologie. Préface de L. Hild. Tome II. Dialogue sur les orateurs. Vie d'Agricola. Des Moeurs des Germains. Histoires. Paris, 1913.

Mercer (S. A. B.) The Oath of Babylonian and Assyrian Literature. With an appendix on the Goddess Esh-Ghanna by Fritz Hommel. Paris, *Paul Geuthner*, 1912. 6 f.

Μελέτη ('H.) Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα. Τεῦχος 10 ον. Νοέμβ., Δεκ., 1912. 'Εν Ἀθήναις. @ 1 δρ.

Murray (Gilbert). Four Stages of Greek Religion (Columbia University Lectures). New York, *Columbia University Press* (Lemcke & Büchner), 1912.

Mussehl (Joachim). De Lucretiani Libri Primi Condicione ac Retractatione. (Diss. Berolin.) Tempelhof bei Berlin, *Gotthelf Schmidt*, 1912.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Paul Caer. Sechzehnter Jahrg. XXXI. u. XXXII. Bandes 1 u. 2 Heft. Leipzig, *B. Teubner*, 1913.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 7/8. 1913. Helsingfors, 1912. Nr. 1/2.

Nuova Cultura (La). Gennaio, 1913. Ann. 1. Fasc. 1. 1 L. *Abbonamento Estero*. 12 L.

Ogle (M. B.) Classical Literary Tradition in Early German and Romance Literature. Modern Language Notes, Dec. 1912.

Ólafsson (Jón). Orðabók Íslenzkrar tungu. Í fjórum bindum. 1. Hefti (A-Ætlun). Reykjavík, *Orðabókarfélag*, 1912. 4°. kr. 5 (or, to subscribers, kr. 3.50) per nr.

Oliphant (S. G.) Sanskrit *dhenā* = Avestan *daēnā* = Lithuanian *dainā*. Reprint from the Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. XXXII Part IV. 1912

Oriental Bibliography (Founded by August Müller). Compiled and Edited by Lucian Scherman. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*, 1912. 14s. 6d. per annum.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. TI-TOMBAC (Vol. X). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1913. \$1.25.

Passow's Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache. Völlig neu bearbeitet v. Wilhelm Crönert. I. Lieferung. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht* New York, *Lemcke & Buechner*, 1912. 2 m. 80.

Pizzagalli (A. M.) Mito e poesia nella Grecia antica. Saggio sulla Teogonia di Esiodo. Catania, *F. Battiato*, 1913. 4 L.



Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von A. Brinkmann. N. F. LXVIII. 1. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerlander's Verlag*, 1913.

Sanders (Henry A.) The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection. The Washington MS. of the Four Gospels. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. IX. 1. New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1912. \$2.

San Nicolò (Mariano). Agyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemaer und Römer. Erster Band. München, *Oskar Beck*, 1913. 7 m.

Sokrates. Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen. Neue Folge. Herausg. v. Otto Schroeder. I. Jahrg. (der ganzen Reihe LXVII Band) 1. Heft. Januar. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*.

Sophokles. Die Spürhunde. Ein Satyrspiel. Frei übersetzt von Carl Robert. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1912. 60 ff.

Soveri (Henricus F.) De Ludorum Memoria praecipue Tertullianea. Capita selecta. Helsingforsiae, 1912.

Steele (R. B.) Case usage in Livy. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus*, 1913.

Stobaei (Johannis) Anthologium Recensuerunt Curtius Wachsmuth et Otto Hense. Vol. Quintum. Anthologii Libri Quarti Partem alteram ab Ottone Hense editam continens. Berolini, *Apud Weidmannos*, MCMXII. 18 m.

Studies in Philology: Philological Club of the University of North Carolina. Vol. IX. Booker (John Manning). The French "Inchoative Suffix -iss and the French -ir Conjugation in Middle English. (1912.) Vol. X. Bain (Charles W.) The Demonstrative Pronoun in Sophocles: Part I. Howe (George). Recent Criticism of Latin Literature. Chapel Hill (N. C.), 1913.

Tacitus Annals V. VI. XI. XII. Abridged from the larger work of Henry Furneaux by H. Pitman. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*.

Taylor (Lily Rose). The Cults of Ostia. Bryn Mawr Monograph Series, Vol. XI. Bryn Mawr College, Penn., Dec., 1912.

Van Deman (Esther B.) Methods of Determining the Date of Roman Concrete Monuments (Second Paper): V. The Period from Augustus to Claudius. Journal of the Archaeological Institute of America, Vol. XVI (1912), No. 3.

Vie de Saint Remi (La). Poème du XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle. Par Richier, Publié pour la première fois d'après deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles par W. N. Bolderston. London, Henry Frowde, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 10 sh. 6 d.

Wackernagel (Jakob). Über einige antike Anredeformen. Programm zur Preisverteilung. Göttingen, 1912.

v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (U.) Sappho und Simonides; Untersuchungen über Griechische Lyriker. 9 m.

— Reden u. Vorträge. Dritte verm. Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1913. 10 m.